

212

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7068-2021

Date of Decision: 17.09.2021

Radha

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Dinesh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.
2. This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 331 dated 07.10.2020, under Sections 396, 201, 193, 194, 195, 203, 211, 419, 420, 435, 302, 120-B, 212 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3(2) (v) (va) of The Schedule Caste & Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities Act) 1989 registered at Police Station Sadar, Hansi, Tehsil Hansi, District Hisar.
3. As per the allegations in the FIR, the accused had conspired to claim insurance amount showing death of Ram Mehar. Ramlu along with the car was burnt. The allegations against the petitioner are that she was aware of the conspiracy and she accompanied Ram Mehar during his visit to Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh).
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 15.10.2020. No active role has been attributed to the petitioner. The investigation is complete.
5. Learned State counsel on instructions opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail. She submits that petitioner was aware of the

conspiracy but she remained silent. She submits that there are thirteen prosecution witnesses out of which three have been examined. She further submits that the petitioner earlier also went to Chhattisgarh, there is every chance of her absconding.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner at this stage submits that petitioner is ready to furnish surety bond of Rupees two lakh of a local surety to meet the apprehension raised by the State counsel.

7. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the nature of allegations and the fact that investigation is complete, conclusion of the trial is likely to take time, the petitioner is granted bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds of Rupees two lakh to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. The petition is allowed.

9. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

17th September, 2021

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No