



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18539-2024

Date of decision: 14.05.2024

Ami Chand and others

....Petitioners

V/s

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr.Vikas Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate, for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.533 dated 10.12.2023 registered for the offences punishable under Section 304-B of IPC at Police Station Kheri Pul, Faridabad, District Faridabad.
2. On 18.04.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Inter alia contends that the death of the deceased took place on 10.12.2023 wherein after inquest proceedings were carried out under Section 174 of Cr.P.C on the same date itself but the petitioners were not named as an accused/suspect; the FIR came to be registered on 10.12.2023 wherein allegations were raised only against the husband-Rinku and it is subsequently on a supplementary statement made by the complainant on 12.12.2023 that the petitioners have also been named & the petitioners are willing to join investigation and cooperate therein.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Adjourned to 08.05.2024.

The petitioners are directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 22.04.2024 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station



and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioners shall join the investigation. They shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Dharampal, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 18.04.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Sh. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate; (appearing for the complainant); has argued that the allegations made against the petitioners are very serious in nature & hence, they ought not to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. In view of above, the present petition is allowed and interim order dated 18.04.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., 1973 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.



8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not
be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

May 14, 2024
poonam

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