

CRM-M-39539-2021

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

CRM-M-39539-2021.

Date of Decision:-27.09.2021.

Seema

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.60 dated 08.06.2021 registered under Sections 379-B (2), 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (offence under Section 201 of IPC has been added later on) at Police Station Mohakampura, District Amritsar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that Gulab Nath, co-accused of the petitioner has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 01.09.2021 passed in CRM-M-34895-2021. It is also argued that even the co-accused, namely, Panchi Nath has also been granted regular bail vide order dated 08.09.2021 passed in CRM-M-36462-2021. It has been further submitted that the case of the petitioner is on parity with the said co-accused, namely, Gulab Nath and

CRM-M-39539-2021

Panchi Nath. It is also submitted that even the petitioner has not been involved in any other case and there is a delay of 13 days in registration of the FIR.

Although, Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab, has opposed the present petition for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, however, could not deny the fact that Gulab Nath and Panchi Nath, co-accused of the petitioner, are absolutely similarly placed as the present petitioner.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, moreso, the fact that the case of co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gulab Nath and Panchi Nath are on a similar footing as with the petitioner, this Court feels that the present petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate and subject to her not being required in any other case.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

September 27, 2021.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Whether Reportable:-

Yes/No

Yes/No