

226.

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

CRM-M-13853-2019

Date of decision: 03.04.2019

KAMLESH

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Ivneet Singh Pabla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. *(Oral)*

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.280 dated 09.07.2018 registered under Sections 304-B, 34 of IPC at Police Station Salhawas, District Jhajjar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the deceased-Priyanka was married with Vinod Kumar on 18.07.2013 and out of their wedlock, a child was born to them. The allegation against the petitioner (mother-in-law) is demand of dowry and beating on the person of deceased, for which, she burnt herself. He has further argued that demand of a car and that too after more than 5 ½ years, is unrealistic. One son born to the deceased is staying with the petitioner's family. The co-accused Balbir has already been admitted on bail by this Court vide order dated 25.01.2019 passed in CRM-M-44755-2018 titled as “Balbir Versus State of Haryana”.

Moreover, the trial in the case will take sufficient long time. The petitioner is in custody since 27.08.2018 and no useful purpose would be served to keep the petitioner in custody for unlimited period.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the custody. However, she states that it is on account of beating caused on the person of the deceased, she committed suicide as there was demand of a car.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

The deceased-Priyanka was married with Vinod Kumar on 18.07.2013. One child was born to them, who is statedly residing with the petitioner's family. The petitioner (mother-in-law) is in custody since 27.08.2018. The trial in the case will take sufficient long time as no prosecution witness has been examined so far.

Considering the fact that the petitioner, being lady, is in custody since 27.08.2018 and the trial in the case will take sufficient long time, this Court deems it appropriate to admit the petitioner on bail.

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

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

03.04.2019
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No