

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

CRM -M-11750 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.07.2017

Preetam @ Parveen

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.N. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Sadhu Ram.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No. 0003 dated 02.01.2017, registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 of IPC, at Police Station Line Par, Bahadurgarh.

It is contended that Ravita, wife of the petitioner committed suicide in her parental home. There is not an iota of evidence to connect the petitioner with crime. Co-accused, Murti has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the trial Court. The petitioner is in custody since 06.03.2016.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application and states that there are specific allegations against the petitioner in the FIR.

Heard.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 06.03.2016, the challan stands presented; charges have been framed; out of total 16 PWs, none has been examined so far, therefore, it can be safely inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, without advertng to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.07.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No