

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

CRM-M-23739 of 2020

DATE OF DECISION : 23.09.2020

Poonam

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

(Presence marked through video conference).

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

This is second petition for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.136 dated 24.08.2018 under Sections 306/388/389/201/34 IPC registered at Police Station Sohna, District Gurugram.

2. Per allegations, FIR was registered on the complaint of Rajender, who stated to the effect that he is a depot holder for the last 16/17 years. A girl namely Poonam, aged about 26 years, visited his office, who wanted to get her ration card issued in lieu of money. He refused to do so. On 23.08.2018, she called him at her house and offered him tea. No one else was present at her home at that time. She removed her clothes and established physical relationship with him. Thereafter, she telephonically called her family members and extorted one blank cheque apart from Rs.50,000/- in cash. She also demanded Rs.10 lakhs in lieu of blank cheque signed by him under the fear of defamation. Poonam kept on blackmailing him by repeatedly calling him from

her mobile phone. Since he was not having that much money, he therefore rather consumed two sulphas tablets to commit suicide.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that all the prosecution witnesses have been examined. At this stage there is thus no scope of petitioner tampering with the evidence or influencing any prosecution witnesses. He also submits that co-accused Rohit has already been granted bail by the Sessions Court.

4. Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana, appearing on behalf of State of Haryana does not controvert that all the prosecution witnesses have been examined and thereafter further trial is held up due to COVID-19 pandemic.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, as also learned State counsel and the fact that since all the prosecution witnesses have been examined and no further progress/defence witness examination is likely to take place in near future, keeping in view the current pandemic scenario. I am of the view that no purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 06.09.2018.

6. In the premise, the instant petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, as the case may be.

SEPTEMBER 23, 2020
shalini

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No