

NAVEEN VS STATE OF HARYANA

Present:- Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Tejas Bansal, Advocate
for the Petitioner.

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.431 dated 12.06.2023 registered under Sections 308, 323, 341, 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station City Rohtak, District Rohtak.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present occurrence took place on account of road rage and it is a case of version and cross-version as is borne out from the FIR got registered by the petitioner side (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion for 06.10.2023.

Mr. S.K. Panwar, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to*

dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country, without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his passport, if any.

Meanwhile, the State counsel is directed to file an affidavit as to the exact role of the petitioner along with the details of pending FIRs, if any, on or before the next date of hearing.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

July 13, 2023
jitesh