



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M-32155-2024
Date of decision: November 22nd, 2024

Sahil Kumar and others
.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ishan Khetarpal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Petition dismissed as infructuous qua petitioner No.5
(vide order dated 08.08.2024).

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

Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu and Mr. Hari Pal, Advocates
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.32 dated 19.03.2024 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 325 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Naggal, District Ambala.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 09.07.2024, following submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners were recorded:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners, inter alia, contends that a perusal of the FIR, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1 clearly reveals that the parties are closely related to each other and it is on account of some land dispute between them, the occurrence in question took place. However, a twisted

**CRM-M-32155-2024****-2-**

version had been brought forth by the complainant while lodging the FIR for reasons but obvious. It has also been submitted that subsequent to the registration of the FIR in question, the parties with the intervention of well wishers had arrived at an amicable settlement and in pursuance of the same, this Court had been approached by way of CRM-M-17783-2024 for quashing of the FIR in question.”

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 08.08.2024, petitioners No.1 to 4 and 6 had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of order dated 08.08.2024, petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

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

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 08.08.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

November 22nd, 2024*Puneet***(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No