



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

1) CRM-M-26494-2024
Decided on : 23.01.2025

Satish Kumar @ Monty . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

2) CRM-M-30472-2024

Ajay . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

3) CRM-M-30242-2024

Rahul . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

4) CRM-M-31078-2024

Pardeep Yadav . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

5) CRM-M-31914-2024

Rahul . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

6) CRM-M-33454-2024

Yogesh Yadav . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent(s)

7) CRM-M-30779-2024
Jagbir Singh and another
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent(s)

8) CRM-M-30819-2024
Akash
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent(s)

9) CRM-M-36175-2024
Prashant Yadav
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-26494-2024).

Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-30472-2024).

Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner(s)
(in CRM-M-30242, 30819, 31078 & 33454-2024).

Mr. S.K. Tripathi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-31914-2024).

Mr. Navjot Singh Sidhu, Advocate for
Mr. Anmol Partap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-30779-2024).

Mr. Yogesh Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-36175-2024).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Kumar Boken, Advocate, for the complainant(s)
(in CRM-M-31914 & 33454-2024).

Mr. Jitender Saini, Advocate, for the complainant(s).
(in CRM-M-30242, 30819, 30472-2024).

Mr. Dharamvir Sharma, Advocate, for the complainant(s)
(in CRM-M-26494, 30779, 31078-2024).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-26494-2024, CRM-M-30472-2024, CRM-M-30242-2024, CRM-M-31078-2024, CRM-M-31914-2024, CRM-M-33454-2024, CRM-M-30779-2024, CRM-M-30819-2024 and CRM-M-36175-2024, as all the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-26494-2024.

2. Prayer in these petition, filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, who have been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 308, 323, 452, 506 of IPC, in a case arising out of FIR No. 183, dated 09.04.2024, registered at Police Station Khedki Daula, District Gurugram.

3. On the very outset, Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate, representing the petitioners in CRM-M-30242, 30819, 31078 & 33454-2024, produces the copy of the order dated 17.01.2025, passed in CRM-M-63533-2024, titled as, “**Satish Kumar and others v. State of Haryana and others**”, and submits that on the basis of settlement/compromise-deed dated 22.11.2017, the FIR in question and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, have been quashed *qua* the accused persons.

Copy of the order dated 17.01.2025, passed in CRM-M-63533-2024, is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

4. Counsel for the petitioners submit that since the FIR and all consequential proceedings have already been quashed, therefore, present petition(s) have been rendered infructuous and be disposed of as such.

Said fact is not disputed by counsel for the respondents/complainants also.

5. Accordingly, present petition(s) are disposed of as infructuous.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 23, 2025
J.Ram

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