



CRM-M-7376-2024 and connected cases

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101-2 to 4

(I) CRM-M-7376-2024
Date of Decision : May 30, 2024

SUNIL KUMAR -PETITIONER
V/S
STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR -RESPONDENTS

(II) CRM-M-7427-2024

SUNIL KUMAR -PETITIONER
V/S
STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR -RESPONDENTS

(III) CRM-M-7883-2024

SUNIL KUMAR -PETITIONER
V/S
STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR -RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate
for the respondent No.2 (in all petitions).

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, challenge to the orders granting bail/anticipatory bail to the respondent No.2 (in all these petitions), is based on the fact that, the learned trial Court has erroneously relied upon the interim protection given by this Court in the anticipatory bail petition of co-accused Neelam Kumari @ Neelam Godara, whereas, the learned trial Court ought to have awaited the outcome of the anticipatory

**CRM-M-7376-2024 and connected cases****2**

bail petition of the co-accused (supra).

2. However, since this Court has, vide order of even date, drawn upon “CRM-M-62311-2023”, titled as “*NEELAM KUMARI @ NEELAM GODARA V/S STATE OF PUNJAB*”, confirmed the interim bail granted to the co-accused Neelam Kumari, therefore, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, when the respondent No.2 (in all these petitions) are admittedly on a co-equal pedestal as co-accused Neelam Kumari, therefore, there remains no other argument.

3. The instant petition are accordingly **dismissed**.

4. A photocopy of this order be placed on file of each connected case.

May 30, 2024
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No