

101+201

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

(I)

CRM-M-39973-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision:09.12.2022

CHAMAN LAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

(II)

CRM-M-40592-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision:09.12.2022

KRISHAN KUMAR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

Present: Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-39973-2022)

Mr. Anil Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. J.P. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-40592-2022)

Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

Both the bail petitions as cast under Section 438 Cr.P.C., shall be disposed of through a common order, as they arise from a common FIR.

2. The petitioners herein had earlier made a motion before this Court, through theirs respectively instituting CRM-M-27414-2021 and CRM-M-28795-2021. In the above motion a claim for anticipatory bail is craved for by the petitioners. The above claim was raised in respect of FIR No.90 of 06.03.2019, wherein, became embodied offences constituted under Sections

Station City Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh. On the above petition, this Court on 22.11.2021 had granted the craved for indulgence to the bail petitioners.

3. Through orders made thereons, on 06.09.2022, this Court had granted ad-interim bail to the present bail petitioners.

4. However, subsequently since non-bailable and cognizable offences as embodied in the Prevention of Corruption Act have been added in the FIR (supra). Therefore, the above additions has led the the present bail petitioners, to re-access this Court with petitions under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., for theirs being admitted to pre-arrest bail.

5. The learned State counsel on instructions given to him by ASP Siddhant Jain submits, that the condition set forth in paragraph 7 of the order made in CRM-M-27414-2021 and in CRM-M-28795-2021, have been complied with by the present petitioners. Moreover, he further submits that, the custodial interrogation of the bail petitioners is not required in respect of offences constituted under the Prevention of Corruption Act, and, which have been subsequently added in the FIR (supra).

6. In the wake of the above, this Court also does not deem it fit and appropriate to order for the custodial interrogation of the present bail petitioners.

7. In summa the orders as made, by this Court, on 06.09.2022, upon petitions (supra), are made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

8. Disposed of.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand(s), disposed of.

10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

09.12.2022

ithlesh

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No

ITHLESH KUMAR
2022.12.13 11:32
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order