



214

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

CRM-M-33750-2023(o&M)

Date of Decision:25.02.2025

Kamal Singh

....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for cancellation of regular bail granted to the main accused (respondent No.2) vide order dated 04.07.2023 (P-2) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari, in case FIR No.198, dated 22.06.2023, under Sections 307, 147, 148, 149, 506, 120-B IPC, and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Kasola, District Rewari.

2. The reason for grant of bail has been assigned in paragraph No. 5 of the order dated 04.07.2023, wherein it is recorded that at the time of incident respondent No.2 was not present and said fact was confirmed by the Investigating Officer also, who was present before the concerned Court. Relevant observation made in paragraph No. 5 is reproduced herebelow:

“ 5. After hearing the submissions made in this case and going through the facts of this case, it is clear from the statement given by the complainant to the police



CRM-M-33750-2023(O&M)

-2-

that accused Satish had business rivalry with the complainant. Both were working transport company, engaged in various companies at IMT Bawal. The present accused Chatarpal alleged to have threatened the complainant four days prior to the occurrence, but no such FIR was lodged against accused Chatarpal by the complainant. At the time of alleged occurrence, accused Chatarpal was not present at the spot and he has not caused any injury to anyone. The investigating officer, who is present in Court, has also confirmed this fact that accused Chatarpal was not present at the time of alleged occurrence.”

3. With the assistance of learned State counsel, Court has been apprised that even as per present petition, neither there is any averment of issuance of any threat at the instance of respondent No.2 after granting of bail; nor of misuse of the concession of bail in any manner. On the previous date of hearing, no one was present on behalf of the petitioner and today again no one is present to assist the Court.

4. This Court on its own and also with the assistance of learned State counsel examined the record before it and finds that nothing wrong has been recorded by learned trial Court, while granting bail to respondent No.2, therefore, the present petition being devoid of merits, is dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 25, 2025
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO