

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-10147 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.03.2017

Silochana

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Balraj Singh Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

This order shall dispose of the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C seeking the benefit of regular bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.0037 dated 21.2.2017 under sections 147, 307, 341, 427, 448, 506, 115, 120-B read with section 149 I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Uklana, District Hisar.

Learned counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Satish. Complainant asserted that he was earlier running a hotel at Uklana but the present petitioner was having enmity with him and on account of the threats having been extended, he had shifted his base to Panchkula. It has been alleged that on 20.2.2017 when the complainant had come to Uklana for some personal work, then, the present petitioner came to know of such fact and she along with 10/15 other goons and who were armed with weapons, accosted the complainant while he was going in his Ritz car. One of the goons is stated to have hit a brick which broke the front windscreen of the car.

Petitioner, who is a lady was arrested on 22.2.2017.

It is a case of no injury.

It has also gone uncontroverted that earlier in point of time FIR No.250 dated 20.12.2015 was registered at Police Station, Uklana under sections 285, 294, 506 IPC and sections 25, 54 of Arms Act at the instance of the present petitioner and against the complainant.

Learned State counsel would very fairly apprise the Court that in such FIR the complainant already stands convicted by the Trial Court.

Under such circumstance, the contention raised by counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated and the present FIR is a counter blast to the FIR earlier lodged by the present petitioner, cannot be said to be without substance.

Even though, Court has been apprised that investigation is still under way, yet, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of bail.

Without making any observations on merits, present petition is allowed. Petitioner be enlarged on bail subject to satisfaction of C.J.M./Duty Magistrate, Hisar.

Petition disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

29.03.2017

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable: No