

223

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

CRM-M-36252 of 2017

Date of decision: October 24, 2017

Manju

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Short reply by way of affidavit of Raj Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police (HQ), Karnal, filed by learned State counsel and reply filed by learned counsel for respondent No.2 today in Court, are taken on record.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned State counsel has pointed out Annexure R-1 along with short reply by way of affidavit dated 18.10.2017, in which it is stated that the departmental enquiry against respondent No.2-V.S. Rathore is already on.

Let the departmental enquiry be completed within a period of 6 months in any case. In so far as the petition for cancellation of bail is concerned, I find that respondent No.2 has undertaken in Para 9 of its reply which reads thus:-

“9.The answering respondent has never misused the concession of bail and neither left with any concerned with the petitioner and even undertakes not to visit to the place of residence/district of the petitioner even fell terrorised on the bands of the petitioner.”

Above undertaking is accepted as a statement to this Court and failure to comply with the undertaking shall amount to contempt of this Court.

In view of the fact that respondent No.2 has already under suspension and inquiry is pending, I do not think any useful purpose would be served in cancelling the bail.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

October 24, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No