

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

Crl. Misc. M-30483 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 27, 2018

Rukshana

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Vineet Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C., seeking the cancellation of bail granted to respondents No.2 and 3 by an order dated 17.07.2017 in FIR No.192 dated 12.06.2017, under Sections 354-B, 34 of Indian Penal Code, later on Section 376 read with Section 511 of IPC has been added, registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that after obtaining interim bail from this court by an order dated 17.07.2017 passed in Criminal Misc. No.M-25149 of 2017, accused-respondents No.2 and 3 are threatening the petitioner for effecting compromise or to face dire

consequences.

Notice of motion was issued in the matter, in response to which a detailed reply has been filed by the respondent-State, in which it is submitted that the petitioner-complainant has already been provided supervisory security for her safety by patrolling party, PCR, rider etc. and till date, except the incident of FIR, the petitioner-complainant never approached the local police about any other incident.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the fact that the petitioner-complainant has already been provided supervisory security by the patrolling party, no further orders are called for in the matter.

The petition in hand stands disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

April 27, 2018
vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
Yes/No