

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

CRM-M No. 8072 of 2019

Date of decision : 18.03.2019

Geeta Devi and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

* * *

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to them in case FIR No.326 dated 12.03.2017 under Sections 302, 307, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 472, 419, 420 and 216 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station – Gurgaon Sadar, Distt. Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that all the family members of the petitioners have been implicated in the case, whereas, the allegations against the petitioners attracts Section 120-B IPC. Husbands of both the petitioners are in custody. They are having minor children and there is no other person to look after them.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioners and have also gone through the contents of the FIR and other documents on file.

Admittedly, the petitioners are PO and others are in custody and facing trial. The allegations are to be tested by the trial Court during the course of the trial. Order of declaring the petitioners as PO has not been challenged and being PO, the petitioners are not entitled for anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

However, the petitioners are at liberty to surrender before the trial Court and move application for regular bail within a period of one week from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case they do so, the trial Court is directed to consider and decide their bail applications within a period of two weeks thereafter in accordance with law.

18.03.2019

sunil yadav

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No