

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46137-2019

Date of Decision: 13.12.2019

Tejo

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Amrik Singh Kalra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G., Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Though Mr. Kalra, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that as per the FSL report there was no petrol/diesel or kerosine in the half burnt clothes stated to have been worn by the deceased, whereas the deceased statement under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. was to the effect that the petitioner, i.e. her mother-in-law had thrown petrol over her; and she has been in custody for one year, two months and seven days, learned counsel for the State submits that the FSL report would be secondary to the statement of the deceased herself, recorded before the Magistrate.

He further submits that out of 21 prosecution witness, 11 have been examined.

Upon query, he, on instructions from the police official who is present in Court today to assist him, submits that the remaining witnesses as are to be examined, are all police officials and the doctor who conducted the post-mortem examination.

Even so, looking at the nature of the offence, this petition is dismissed, but with the trial Court directed to ensure that the trial is expedited.

If the trial is still not concluded within a period of five months from today, the petitioner would be entitled to file a petition seeking bail again, provided of course that the delay is not seen to be that of the petitioners' counsel or witnesses.

December 13, 2019
nitin/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.