

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17655-2019

Date of decision: 22.04.2019

Ramwati

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Saleem Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. J.P. Jangu, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.102 dated 25.03.2019 under Sections 306, 506, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, got registered by Sumitra Devi, her husband Karamvir Singh had gone to house of the petitioner, as he was called by complainant Rachna in FIR under Sections 376B, 506 IPC, which was registered against son of the complainant namely Karan Singh and five other persons. It is further stated in the FIR that when the deceased Karamvir Singh visited the house of the complainant in the aforesaid case/FIR, he met Reena, her mother/petitioner Nitesh and her brother-

in-law Suresh Kumar, who demanded Rs.35.00 lacs for withdrawing the case and further threatened that if he did not make the payment, they may further involve another son of the complainant namely Arjun. Perusal of the FIR further shows that when deceased husband of the complainant came back to his house, he told the complainant about demand of Rs.35.00 lacs, however, he had not named any person specifically as to who had made the demand of Rs.35.00 lacs. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner is implicated in the case because she is mother of Rachna, who is complainant in FIR No.405 dated 08.11.2018 under Section 376 2 (N), 506, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Gurgaon City.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Pawanbir Singh, and assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has however opposed the prayer for bail.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I find merit in the present petition.

Without commenting anything on merits of the case and finding that there is no direct allegation of abetment against the petitioner, this petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to join investigation subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Petition is disposed of.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

22.04.2019
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No