

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

**AT CHANDIGARH**

**Criminal Misc. No.M-27181 of 2018**

**Date of Decision: 10.07.2018**

Sonia

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA**

Present:- Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)**

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.71 dated 05.04.2017 under Sections 302, 120-B, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Baroda, District Sonapat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no allegation against the petitioner in the aforesaid FIR so far as murder of Amit is concerned. He has referred to statement of complainant Ranjit, who has appeared as PW-6, to the effect that when the complainant visited the house of the accused, he found so many persons standing there and the dead body of Amit was lying in the verandah of the house. The petitioner was standing near the dead body of Amit and was weeping. When the

complainant enquired from the petitioner as to why his son Amit has been killed, she told him that they wanted to marry with each other. He also referred to the statement made by Sonia, which is part of challan Annexure P-2 and there is nothing to suggest that she facilitated the murder of Amit in any manner.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Raj Pal, submits that the petitioner was also involved in the case and there is disclosure statement of Sonia which led to recovery of *danda*.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is stated to be in custody for more than 1 year and 3 months. The complainant Ranjit, who is father of the deceased, has been examined and in his statement, he has not stated that the petitioner participated in the murder of the deceased Amit. He has stated that the petitioner was standing near the dead body of his son and was weeping. On inquiry, she has disclosed that she wanted to marry the deceased Amit. Therefore, the possibility of honour killing cannot be ruled out at this stage.

Be that as it may, considering the statement of PW-6 Ranjit Singh, complainant and the fact that petitioner is in custody for 1 year and 3 months and trial in the case will take sufficiently long time and no useful purpose will be served to keep the petitioner in custody for indefinite period, I deem it appropriate to release him on regular bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted on regular bail, subject to furnishing of her bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not influence the witnesses, directly or indirectly, in any manner and finding so, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move appropriate application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

Needless to say that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as any expression on the merits of the case.

July 10, 2018  
**AK**

**( HARI PAL VERMA )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No