

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

CRM-M-12834-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.01.2021

Virender Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. B.S. Rana, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Divya Bajaj, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 446 dated 22.10.2018 registered under Sections 304-B and 34 IPC, at Police Station Indri, District Karnal.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is father-in-law of Charanjeet Kaur (since deceased), whose marriage was solemnised with son of petitioner-Munish Kumar on 05.02.2018. Earlier, the petitioner was granted interim bail by a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 25.09.2020.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner further points out that complainant-Surjit Singh has admitted in his cross-examination that the petitioner, who was working in a factory at Panipat and living there in a rented accommodation, used to visit the matrimonial house of Charanjeet Kaur occasionally. Moreover, Charanjeet Kaur was suffering from dengue and her platelets got dropped prior to her death. The petitioner has been in custody for the last more than 2 years.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the fact regarding the custody period of the petitioner but points out that Charanjeet Kaur (since deceased) had committed suicide in her matrimonial home within a period of 8 months of her marriage.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody for the last more than 2 years. In his cross examination, the complainant had admitted that the petitioner used to visit the matrimonial of deceased-Charanjeet Kaur occasionally, which means he was not regularly living with them. The trial will take time to conclude, especially due to prevailing situation of Covid-19. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

15.01.2021
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No