



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(209)

CRM-M-31725-2024
DATE OF DECISION: 27.08.2024

Laxmi Devi and othersPetitioners

VERSUS

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM HON’BLE MR.JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present Mr.Himanshu Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupinder Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. A.K.Garg, Advocate,
for complainant.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J (ORAL)

1. On 05.07.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order,
upon the instant petition:-

“1. Through the instant petition, as instituted under
Section 438 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek the concession of
anticipatory bail, in case FIR No.131 dated 18.03.2024, under Sections
148, 149, 323, 506 of the IPC (Section 307 of the IPC added
subsequently), registered at P.S. City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
the injury(ies), which attracted the penal provision of Section 307 of
the IPC has been attributed to co-accused Dharampal, whereas, no
specific injury has been attributed to the petitioners. He further
submits that it is a case of version and cross-version, inasmuch as, in
respect of the same incident, the petitioner No.1 had, prior to
registration of the present FIR, already got registered an FIR No.130
dated 18.03.2024 against the complainant party.

3. Notice of motion for 27.08.2024.

4. Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice
on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana.



5. *In the meantime, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation and to appear before the investigating agency, as and when called upon to do so. In the event of their arrest, they shall be admitted to interim bail on them furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C ”*

2. Today, the learned State counsel has, on instructions imparted to him by the official concerned, stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioners had joined investigation and they are no longer required for further custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 05.07.2024, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

- “(i) the petitioners shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;
- (ii) the petitioners shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;
- (iii) the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner(s) 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.

5. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

27.08.2024
mamta

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No