

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

205

CRM-M-32640-2022

Date of Decision: 15.11.2022

Raj Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Pranshul Dhull, Advocate for
Ms. Sandhya Gaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of the order dated 08.08.2022, the petitioners have joined the investigation.

Counsel for the State does not dispute the above said contention but opposes the bail.

Since the offence under section 307 IPC was added later on, as a result of multiple effects of the injury, and coupled with the fact that the petitioners are first offenders, the interim order dated 08.08.2022 is made absolute, subject to the following condition:-

“Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from release from prison and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules.”

Petition is allowed in the terms mentioned above. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE**

15.11.2022

anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable?

Yes/no
Yes/no