

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

CRM-M-52256 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 21, 2020

Kaushlya Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG Haryana.

Mr. P.S. Sullar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This is a petition that has been filed under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. for cancellation of bail order dated 25.05.2018 whereby, anticipatory bail had been allowed to respondent No.2 in case FIR No.07 dated 19.01.2018, under Sections 376, 506, 328 of IPC and Section 66-E of IT Act.

Counsel for the petitioner herein contends that after the petitioner has been released on anticipatory bail on 25.05.2018, the petitioner herein namely Kaushlya Devi has been subjected to threat at the hands of respondent No.2

On the other hand, counsel for respondent No.2 denies the

allegations as set out in the petition, while submitting that the matter has been investigated thoroughly and nothing incriminating has been found against him. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that statement of the private witnesses has been recorded in the matter.

In the reply filed by the respondent-State, it has been categorically stated that the complaint as filed by the petitioner regarding allegations of threat has not been substantiated.

I have heard counsel for the parties and in view of the fact that there is no evidence available on the record to substantiate any of the plea as taken by the petitioner that she is facing threat and the said allegation has been found to be false, as such, there is no ground made out to cancel the anticipatory bail, which has been allowed to respondent No.2.

In view of the above, the petition in hand is hereby dismissed.

January 21, 2020
vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No