

CRM-M-34896-2021

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

CRM-M-34896-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision:05.10.2021

Amit Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Edward Augustine George, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.195 dated 01.09.2020 registered at Police Station Chappar, District Yamunanagar, under Sections 304-B read with Section 34 IPC (Section 406 IPC added later on).

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is husband of deceased-Neha Verma. The marriage of deceased-Neha Verma was solemnized with the petitioner on 24.11.2017. The deceased being constantly unwell was ultimately operated upon in July, 2019 and due to that she committed suicide. It is further submitted that co-accused, namely, Mohan Lal Verma and Raj Rani, who are the parents-in-law of the deceased, have already been granted regular bail by this Court, vide orders dated 19.01.2021 and 23.04.2021 respectively. Moreover, the material prosecution witnesses, i.e. complainant-Satish Kumar Verma, Baby Sharma, Seema Devi, Anil Kumar and Ankit Verma have turned hostile. The petitioner has been in custody since 01.09.2020.

CRM-M-34896-2021

Learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner and the fact that the parents of the petitioner have already been granted regular bail. However, he submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased and there are serious allegations against him as the deceased had expired in the matrimonial home within seven years of her marriage.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As noticed above, the material witnesses, including the complainant, have turned hostile and the parents of the petitioner have already been granted regular bail by this Court. The petitioner has been in custody since 01.09.2020. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. Therefore, 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 present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

05.10.2021

ishwar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No