

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

CRM-M-40419 of 2019(O&M)

Date of Decision:17.12.2019

Aarti and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Dhruv Sihag, Advocate
for the applicants-petitioners.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, DAG, Haryana.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.(Oral)

CRM-31986-2019

Present application has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for pre-poning the date of hearing of the present case.

As the main case is already fixed for today i.e.17.12.2019, the present application has rendered infructuous.

CRM-M-40419-2019

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking bail pending trial in case FIR No. 317 dated 22.07.2019, under Sections 147, 149, 323, 379-B, 452 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sector 58, Faridabad.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that this is a case of version and cross-version and the petitioner side have also suffered injuries in the occurrence and reference is made to Annexure P-4 i.e. FIR lodged at the instance of petitioner No.2-Malti. Also contends that after investigation in the matter report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was submitted and charges were framed on 11.12.2019. Further contends that there is no other criminal case pending against the petitioners.

Learned State counsel has duly acknowledged the above

factual position on instructions from the police official.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.

Since the investigation is already over in the matter and after submission of report under Section 173 Cr.P.C, charges have also been framed on 11.12.2019. Keeping in view of the fact that both the petitioners are females, confined in custody since 05.08.2019; the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore no useful purpose would be served by keeping them behind the bars any more.

In view of the abovesaid circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. Petitioners namely, Aarti and Malti be admitted to bail on their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate.

However, it is made clear that above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merit of the case pending before learned trial Court.

[MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU]
JUDGE

December 17, 2019

rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable?

yes/no
yes/no