

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

**CRM-M No.15679 of 2017  
Date of Decision: 16.05.2017**

**Banan Sohar Ratta**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**..... Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL**

Present: Mr. Jai Vir Yadav, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana  
for the respondent-State.

**DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)**

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in FIR No.1259, dated 21.11.2016, registered under Sections 406 and 420/34 IPC, at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

Seeking regular bail for the petitioner, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been in custody for the last over 03 months; is a lady having three children; since the challan has already been filed, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody; she is not involved in any other case and that as the charge is yet to be framed, the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future.

Learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner's husband is absconding and that there are serious allegations against both the petitioner and her husband of having extracted Rs.36 lakhs on the pretext of getting land allotted to the complainants at a concessional rate.

Since the petitioner is a lady having three children; has been in custody for over 03 months in a Magisterial trial; challan has already been filed; there is no other case pending against her; out of the 18 witnesses cited by the prosecution none has been examined and for the reason that the petitioner should not be made to pay for the sins of her husband, who is said to be absconding, I am of the opinion that the petitioner be admitted to regular bail.

Bail to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Karnal.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

If the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal activity/misusing the concession of bail granted to him, it would be open to the State to move an appropriate application before the Competent Court/this Court for cancellation of the bail granted to the petitioner through this order.

**May 16, 2017**  
*rittu*

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No