

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

1. CRM-M No.13632 of 2023

Ratan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

2. CRM-M No.16739 of 2023

Satguru @ Sattu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

Date of decision: 24th May, 2023

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Kuljinder S. Dhindsa, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.13632 of 2023.

Mr. Kuldeep S. Siwach, Advocate for
Mr. Lakhwinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.16739 of 2023.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Both the above detailed petitions are being taken up
together for disposal by way of this common order.

2. The petitioners are seeking the concession of bail under
Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.160 dated 17.05.2022 under
Sections 148, 149, 323, 379-B, 452 IPC (Section 427, 201 IPC and

Section 25 of the Arms Act added later on) registered at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia submit that a false case has been planted upon the petitioners, which is evident from the fact that neither were they named in the FIR in question, and still further, subsequent to the registration of the FIR, the parties had arrived at an amicable settlement. It has been further submitted that a petition bearing CRM-M No.6567 of 2023 had been filed before this Court for quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties, wherein not only had the complainant appeared and admitted to the compromise having been effected but this Court, vide order dated 17.05.2023, had also directed the parties to get their statements recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate qua the compromise effected between them. It has still further been submitted that the petitioners have clean antecedents as they are not involved in any other criminal case, much less a case of similar nature.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, on instructions from ASI Kailash, has not been able to controvert that the petitioners were not named in the FIR in question and that a petition for quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of compromise had been filed before this Court. Learned State counsel, however, submits that challan stands presented and charges have been framed by the trial Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. In the facts and circumstances, as enumerated hereinabove, coupled with the fact that the parties have amicably settled the dispute, for which, as already observed hereinabove the parties have been directed to get their statements recorded before the trial Court, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioners. The petitions, as such, are allowed and the petitioners are admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 24, 2023
rps

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