

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-53690-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 19.12.2019

Geeta Rani

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ram Pal Verma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Choudhary, Addl. A.G. Haryana,
assisted by ASI Sudesh Kumar.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner-Geeta Rani has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in a case registered vide FIR No.305, dated 6.7.2019, registered at Police Station Ganaur, District Sonapat, under Sections 498-A, 304-B, 34 IPC.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Ms. Usha wherein it has been alleged that marriage of her daughter Sushmita was solemnized with Anil on 18.11.2018 and that they had given dowry as per their capacity but in-laws of her daughter were not satisfied with the same and started taunting her daughter for having brought insufficient

dowry. It is alleged that complainant's daughter was also given beatings by her husband Anil, mother-in-law Birmati and sister-in-law Geeta (*nanand*). It is alleged that the in-laws also raised demand of ₹50,000/-. It is further stated therein that on 6.7.2019 complainant's son-in-law Anil called the complainant telephonically and informed her that complainant's daughter has consumed some poisonous substance and is admitted in hospital. When the complainant went to the hospital, she found her daughter unconscious and who later expired.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case simply in order to pressurize the entire family of husband of deceased. It has been submitted that the petitioner is a married sister of husband of deceased who had been married since the last about 8 years and had been residing separately in Delhi. Learned counsel in this regard has drawn the attention of this Court to order dated 23.11.2019 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat, wherein it has been recorded that the learned Public Prosecutor had conceded the fact that the petitioner had been married in Delhi since the last about 8 years and is having two minor children.
4. The learned State counsel while opposing the petition has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR wherein specific allegations of harassment have been levelled against her, no case for grant of bail is made out.

5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is stated to be residing separately in Delhi, away from the matrimonial home of the deceased and while also bearing in mind that the petitioner is a lady who has been behind bars since the last more than 4 months and challan already stands presented, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and petitioner-Geeta Rani is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

December 19, 2019

mohan

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No