

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

236

**2023:PHHC:134655**

**CRM-M-51680-2023**

Date of decision: October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Vinod Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Senior Deputy Advocate General,  
Haryana.

Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner are seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in case FIR No.360 dated 21.07.2023 under Section 379-B and 342 of the IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Yamuna Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that with the intervention of respectables and relatives, the parties had resolved all their disputes and ironed out their differences, as a result of which a compromise had been effected between them. He submits that a petition seeking quashing of the FIR in question had also been filed i.e. CRM-M-48600-2023, wherein this Court vide order dated 06.10.2023 ((Annexure P-3) had directed the parties to get their respective statements recorded with respect to the compromise so arrived at between them. Learned counsel submits that the petitioners have been in custody since 27.07.2023, 23.07.2023 and 24.07.2023

respectively and challan stands presented. He submits that in view of the matter having been compromised, further incarceration of the petitioners would serve no useful purpose.

3. Learned State counsel, assisted by ASI Rajesh, has not been able to dispute that the parties have filed a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise, whereby they have been directed to get their respective statements recorded. Learned counsel for the complainant has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners qua the parties having indeed settled all disputes and does not oppose the prayer for extending the concession of bail to the petitioners.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioners. The instant petition is, therefore, allowed. The petitioners be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. 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.

**October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023***Puneet***(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No