

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(202)

CRM No. M-42744 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 22.12.2020

Sandeep

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sharad Aggarwal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

CRM-30919-2020

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CRM No. M-42744 of 2020

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 270, dated 18.07.2019, under Sections 302, 304-B, 498-A, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that death of the deceased was due to suicide and not due to forcibly giving poison by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no statement was made by the deceased when she was taken to the hospital, though, she was conscious and was cooperating with the medical treatment. Learned counsel further submits that the co-accused, namely, Santra Devi, has already been granted the benefit of bail by this Court while deciding CRM No. M-12550 of 2020 on 28.05.2020.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sharad Aggarwal, learned Assistant Advocate General,

Haryana, who has also joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Manjit submits that as per allegations in the FIR, present case is of poisoning the deceased at the hands of the accused. Learned State counsel relies upon the disclosure statement of the accused. Learned State counsel concedes that the complainant has already been examined and the trial is likely to take some time before the same concludes.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

The disclosure statement of the accused is yet to be proved. Further, the complainant has already been examined and the trial is likely to take some time before it concludes. Keeping the petitioner behind the bars, especially, when the co-accused, namely, Santra Devi, has already been granted the benefit of bail, will serve no purpose.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has undertaken that the petitioner will not interfere in the trial in any manner.

That being so, the petitioner is granted the benefit of regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

December 22, 2020
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? *Yes*

Whether reportable? *No*