

Sr. No.216

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

CRM No. M- 17093 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:18.05.2017

Krishana

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. D.P.S. Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Saini, DAG, Haryana.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of the instant petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of regular bail to the petitioner pending trial in FIR No.210 dated 21.05.2016, under Sections 302, 201, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the statement Radeshym. Deceased is his son namely Parveen. As per complainant, Parveen (since deceased) was working as a Barber in Rohtak. The complainant had got in touch with the deceased on 13.05.2016, but thereafter his mobile phone was switched off. Complainant's version is that his son had gone missing and it was through newspapers that he learnt that a burnt dead body had been recovered in the fields close to a particular village. Identification of the dead body to be that of Parveen was established through DNA test. Close to the burnt dead body, certain documents as also a burnt mobile was recovered. The

documents led the investigation agency to Ravin i.e. the main accused.

The present petitioner who is a lady, has been implicated in the present case on the disclosure statement made by Ravin.

Motive attributed is that the main accused Ravin was in a illicit relationship with the present petitioner and even Parveen (deceased) had a evil eye upon daughter of the petitioner. Accordingly, a conspiracy has been hatched to eliminate Parveen. Based on the disclosure statement of Ravin, motorcycle allegedly used in the crime has been recovered from the house of the petitioner.

In the present case, the petitioner has faced incarceration since 25.05.2016.

Petitioner is sought to be implicated with the aid of Section 120-B IPC.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Suresh Kumar, has apprised the Court that out of 21 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined till date.

Trial, as such, would take time to conclude.

Without making any observations on merits, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner be enlarged on bail subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate, Rohtak.

Petition disposed of.

18.05.2017*anju rani***(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>