



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

262

CRA-S-353-2024

Date of decision: 25.07.2024

Amit

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Chand Ram Olla, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Nandan Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The appellant is challenging the order dated 18.01.2024 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar whereby his application for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.247 dated 13.04.2023 under Sections 147, 149, 323, 506 of the IPC and Section 3(1)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, 'the SC/ST Act') registered at Police Station Azad Nagar, Hisar, District Hisar, was dismissed.

2. On 30.01.2024, learned counsel for the appellant had made the following submissions:-

“Learned counsel inter alia contends that as per allegations levelled, the occurrence in question took place on 11.04.2023, however, the FIR in question came to be registered two days later which hinted at an exaggerated version having been brought forth by the complainant party. It has still further been submitted that the alleged



CRA-S-353-2024

occurrence took place during night and it is not even the case of the complainant that the alleged casteist utterances were made in full public view. Learned counsel while drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR which has been annexed as Annexure A-1, has further submitted that even otherwise a perusal of the same leaves no manner of doubt that totally vague allegations have been levelled much less any specific attribution qua the alleged casteist utterances or even the injuries allegedly inflicted.”

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 08.04.2024, the appellant had been granted the concession of interim bail and asked to join investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that in compliance of order dated 08.04.2024, the appellant has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the appellant having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the appellant is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2-complainant has also submitted that the parties have in the interregnum amicably arrived at an amicable settlement.

7. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed and interim order dated 08.04.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

25.07.2024

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

Vinay

JUDGE

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