

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

204

**CRM-M-27051-2022
Date of Decision: 16.08.2022**

Amit and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.131 dated 10.05.2020 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 326 IPC 1860 added later on) registered at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

On 27.06.2022, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:

“Inter alia contends that the present case is a case of version and cross version and that FIR no.133 dated 10.05.2020 was got registered by Pardeep son of Kehar Singh against the complainant party with respect to the said incident and as per the allegations in the said FIR, injuries had been inflicted by the complainant party and thus, the said

FIR was registered under Section 307 IPC among other sections. It is further submitted that as per the present FIR, there is no specific injury attributed to the petitioners and the injury, on the basis of which Section 326 IPC has been added, is on the little finger and has been attributed to co-accused Ankit. It is further submitted that co-accused of petitioners Mehar Singh and Anil have already been granted the benefit of concession of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana, appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Mr. Lekh Raj Sharma, Advocate, appears for the complainant. Adjourned to 16.08.2022.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioners are ordered to be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting / Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant are at liberty to produce on record any relevant document, if any, so as to show that the petitioners are not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

*(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE”*

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in pursuance of the said order, the petitioners have joined the investigation and are not involved in any other case.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gulzar

Singh, has submitted that the petitioners have joined the investigation and are not required for any further custodial interrogation.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances moreso, the facts which have been noticed in abovesaid orders dated 27.06.2022 and also the fact that the petitioners have joined the investigation and are not required for further custodial interrogation, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 27.06.2022 is ordered to be made absolute.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

16.08.2022
geeta

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No