

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-64511-2018

Date of Decision:01.02.2019

Suresh Devi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.**

**Present: Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.**

**Ms. Priyanka Sadar, A.A.G., Haryana.**

\*\*\*\*

**HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)**

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.293 dated 07.05.2018 under Sections 304-B, 34, 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in the FIR, there is no specific allegation against the petitioner that she ever raised demand of dowry. All the allegations are of general nature. The complainant has named the whole family in the case and during the course of investigation, husband of the petitioner Anup as well as Sukhvinder, Sandeep and Sumitra were found innocent, which doubts the very case of the prosecution. The petitioner is 58 years of age and is in custody since 15.05.2018. The deceased has left behind a son, who is about 04 years of age and require

take care of him.

Learned State Counsel does not dispute the custody period. However, she states that since deceased-Anju had died because of poisoning within 07 years of the marriage, petitioner has rightly been arrayed as an accused under Section 304-B IPC. The allegations against the petitioner are serious.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is in custody since 15.05.2018, she is 58 years of age and is required to take care of her grandson also, who is about 04 years of age. As per FIR, no external mark of injury has been pointed out on the person of the deceased and no prosecution witness has been examined so far. 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 furnishing of her bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court.

It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

However, the petitioner shall not extend any threat upon the complainant or any other witnesses directly or indirectly.

**February 01, 2019**  
seema

**(HARI PAL VERMA)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No