

102

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

CRM-M-40325 of 2016

Date of decision: November 18, 2016

Sonia and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. Rahul Rathore, Advocate for the petitioners.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG
Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties, perused the
order dated 18.10.2016 and deposition of PW5-Dhanpati as well as
FIR in question.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that there is
discrepancy between the statement in the FIR as well as deposition
before the Court and that discrepancy is inconsistent to the matter.

I have perused the FIR as well as deposition of PW5-
Dhanpati before the Court. Prima-facie, I find that the petitioners being
the women and looking to the nature of inconsistency pointed out to
me, without making any comments on the merits of the matter, the
petitioners deserve to be released on anticipatory bail, till the trial is
pending before the trial Court, in FIR in question. I have also perused

the impugned order that was made in application under Section 319 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

Hence, in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail bonds amounting to ₹10,000/- with one surety of like amount, in the pending trial before the trial Court, till the trial is completed, subject to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned who may impose such conditions as deem fit and proper.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

November 18, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No