

\204

SLP(Crl.)No. 1538 OF 2004

ITEM No.8

Court No. 2

SECTION IIA

A/N MATTER

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 1538/2004

(From the judgement and order dated 09/03/2004 in CRLM 2036/03  
of The HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH)

SANGRAM SINGH & ANR.

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

Respondent (s)

Crl.MP. No. 208/05 (Appln. for deletion of petitioner No.2 from the array of parties)  
( With Appln(s). for stay and Office Report )

Date : 07/01/2005 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. SANTOSH HEGDE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.B. SINHA

For Petitioner (s)Mr. Sidharth Luthra,Adv.  
Mr. Dheeraj Nair,Adv.  
Ms. Smiriti Sinha,Adv.

Ms. Indu Malhotra,Adv.

For Respondent (s)Mr. D.P. Singh,Adv.  
Ms. Avneet Toor,Adv.

Mr Vinay Kumar Garg,Adv.

For R-2:Mr. Harsh Kinra,Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh K. Sharma,Adv.  
Ms. Shalu Sharma,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

Leave granted. The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

(Ganga Thakur)  
PS to Registrar

(Prem Prakash)  
Court Master

Signed order is placed on the file.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
Criminal Appeal(Crl.) NO. 29 OF 2005  
(Arising out of SLP(Crl.) No.1538/04

Sangram Singh & Anr.

....Appellant (s)

Versus

State of Haryana & Anr.

...Respondent (s)

O R D E R

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that so far as the 2nd petitioner in this petition is concerned he has since been discharged, therefore, he seeks permission to withdraw this petition. Permission prayed for is granted. The SLP as against the 2nd petitioner is disposed of as having been withdrawn.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Leave granted.

In the facts and circumstances of this case, we think the High Court is not justified in cancelling the anticipatory bail granted to the appellant. Therefore, we set aside the impugned order and allow this appeal and restore the anticipatory bail granted to the 1st appellant earlier. However, we direct the appellants not to interfere with the investigation, contact witness or in any manner threaten or intimidate them. With the above observation, this appeal succeeds and the same is allowed.

.....J.  
(N. SANTOSH HEGDE)

.....J.  
(S.B. SINHA)

NEW DELHI,  
January 7, 2005