

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(211)

CRM No. M-36562-2020

Date of Decision : 06.12.2021

Saloni Saluja

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.
(keeping in view advance copy given)

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 0243 dated 26.02.2020, registered under Section 10 of Immigration Act and Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 201 IPC at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that though the petitioner has been involved in number of other cases but in most of cases, she has already been granted the concession of regular bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present case, the petitioner is behind bars since 18.06.2020 and as the charges have already been framed and the complainant has already been examined, no useful purpose will be achieved in keeping the petitioner behind bars during the entire period of trial as the petitioner undertakes not to influence the trial in any manner and

to maintain good conduct, if she is granted bail.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel submits that petitioner is a habitual offender against whom 22 cases have been registered though, in some of the cases, she has already been extended the benefit of regular bail. Learned State counsel argues that there is likelihood that the petitioner might influence the trial in case, she is extended the concession of regular bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Though, it is a conceded position between the parties that the petitioner is facing number of cases on the similar allegations of taking money on the pretext of sending people abroad but, as the petitioner is yet to be held guilty, she cannot be kept behind the bars for all time to come even during the trial, especially, when the complainant in the present case has already been examined and nothing is on record so as to opine that petitioner will misuse the concession of bail.

Once, the petitioner has undertaken before this Court that she will not misuse the concession of regular bail so as to influence the trial or the witnesses in any manner, the petitioner has made out a case for the grant of regular bail.

The petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail in this case subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

learned counsel for the petitioner has undertaken before this

Court that the petitioner will not influence the trial in any manner and will maintain good conduct, if she is granted bail. In case of default of the undertaking, the State will be at liberty to approach this Court for passing appropriate orders.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

December 06, 2021
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? *Yes*
Whether reportable? *Yes*