

2024:PHHC:116742



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

103

CRM-M-44127-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.09.2024

Roop Ram @ Ruparam**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and another****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Naresh Kumar Ganga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, filed under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner is seeking concession of anticipatory bail in Criminal Complaint bearing No. COMI/95/2019, titled as ***Sahab Ram vs. Roop Ram and others***, filed under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120-B of IPC, which is pending before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Dabwali.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that similarly situated co-accused Pala Ram, Ram Swaroop and Hanuman had approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail by filing a petition bearing number ***CRM-M-39824-2024*** and vide order dated 14.08.2024, the said petition was allowed and they were ordered to be admitted to bail by the trial Court, subject to their surrendering before it on or before the date fixed, which was 04.09.2024, and on furnishing bonds to

2024:PHHC:116742



its satisfaction. The operative part of the order dated 04.09.2024 reads as under:

“6. The petitioners have been summoned as accused in a private complaint case. Neither their custodial interrogation is required nor any recovery is to be affected from them. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. No purpose would be served by detaining them in custody. They are ready to join the proceedings before the learned trial court. The main purpose for issuance of warrants is to secure the presence of the accused which the petitioners in this case are ready to ensure if extended benefit of anticipatory bail. As such, in the considered opinion of this Court, it is a fit case to extend benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be admitted to bail by learned trial Court, subject to their surrendering before it on or before the date fixed 04.09.2024 and furnishing bonds to its satisfaction.”

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioner is ready to face the trial. His custodial interrogation is not required. He does not have any criminal antecedents. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Since it is a private complaint case, learned State counsel has chosen not to address any argument.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

6. Since the aforesaid similarly situated co-accused have already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court as mentioned

2024:PHHC:116742



above, the present petition is also allowed in the same terms. The petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail by learned trial Court, subject to his surrendering before it within a period of 10 days from today and furnishing bonds to its satisfaction.

06.09.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No