

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

CRM-M-26227-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-18.11.2020

Anjali Sharma

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ajay Ghangas, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.
assisted by ASI Badri Prasad.

Mr. N.S. Shekhawat, Advocate for the complainant.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.307 dated 9.5.2020 at Police Station Ballabhgarh City, District Faridabad under Sections 306 and 34 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was reigstered at the instance of Rameshwer Dayal, wherein it is alleged that his son Neeraj (deceased) was married to Anjali Sharma (petitioner) and that Anjali Sharma, however, used to quarrel with her husband i.e. deceased Neeraj and also with the complainant and other members of his family. It is alleged that complainant's son had told him that

Anjali Sharma used to talk to another boy namely Lokesh and when Neeraj objected to the same, Anjali Sharma quarreled with him and threatened that she would implicate Neeraj and other members of his family. It is further alleged that later Anjali Sharma as well as her parents and other relatives gave beatings to the complainant and his wife regarding which the matter was reported to the police. It is alleged that Neeraj being fed up with the conduct of his wife and other members of her family ultimately ended his life by hanging himself on the night intervening of 8/9.5.2020.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case by her in laws mainly on account of the fact that they had lost their son, who had committed suicide and that, in any case, the petitioner cannot be said to have abetted the commission of suicide by her husband Neeraj. The learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner, in any case, deserves to be released on bail since other co-accused i.e. her parents have already been granted bail by this Court.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, no case for grant of bail is made out. The learned State counsel, upon instruction from ASI Badri Prasad, has, however, informed that as on date the petitioner has been behind bars since the last more than 6 months and that challan already stands presented.
5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and while bearing in mind that the petitioner is a lady and has been behind bars since the last more than 6 months and that challan already stands presented, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is

accepted and the petitioner 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.

18.11.2020
pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No