

219

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

CRM-M No.8624 of 2021(O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.07.2021

Satparkash @ Babla

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.283 dated 23.09.2020 registered under Sections 306, 34 IPC at Police Station Naraiangarh, District Ambala.

As per allegations, complainant Randhir Singh has alleged that his son Sanjeev Kumar was married to Rajni Devi @ Sabana 14 years back. Sanjeev Kumar was running a karyana shop at Kala Amb. Two children took birth out of this wedlock. Rajni Devi @ Sabana and Sanjeev Kumar used to

quarrel very oftenly as Rajni Devi @ Sabana used to talk with the petitioner on mobile phone. Further allegations are that Rajni Devi @ Sabana was having illicit relations with the petitioner. After quarrel with Sanjeev Kumar, Rajni Devi @ Sabana used to stay with the petitioner for many days and due to this reason, Sanjeev Kumar was being defamed in the society. The matter could not be resolved even by Panchayats. Owing to the situation prevailing in the house, Sanjeev Kumar committed suicide by hanging with the ceiling fan at his house.

Rajni Devi @ Sabana filed CRM-M No.36661 of 2020 for grant of regular bail and the same was allowed vide order dated 09.02.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged complicity of the petitioner cannot be read beyond the complicity of Rajni Devi @ Sabana by any stretch of imagination as the petitioner is alleged to be paramour of said Rajni Devi @ Sabana.

The factual details of the case could not be disputed by learned State counsel on instructions from SI Dharambir Singh. Petitioner is in custody since 24.09.2020. Charges have been framed, but no prosecution witness has been examined so far.

Looking to the aforesaid facts and in view of the

situation arising out due to COVID-19 pandemic, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail without adverting to the merits of the case.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

14.07.2021

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No