

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

112

CRM-M-38533-2020

Date of Decision: 20.08.2021

Rani Verma @ Neha @ Divya

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present: Mr. Gourav Verma, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)

Case has been taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing.

Present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C is for grant of regular bail to petitioner-**Rani Verma @ Neha @ Divya** in case FIR No.120 dated 17.03.2020 under Sections 120-B, 201, 328, 384 and 389 IPC, registered at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.

Status report dated 17.08.2021 has been received from trial Court, in terms of which, trial is fixed for 24.08.2021 for arguments on application under Section 311 Cr.P.C. moved by prosecution.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that version, as alleged in the FIR, is totally concocted one and there is no iota of truth therein. He further urges that allegedly petitioner had administered some stupefying substance to complainant-Ghanshyam Dass, due to which

he became semi-unconscious and then she got prepared his obscene video clip. He further urges that co-accused have already been released on bail. He further urges that petitioner is languishing in custody since 19.03.2020 and she is no more required by the Police for any investigation purpose. He further submits that after completion of investigation, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (*Challan*) has already been presented in Court. He further urges that testimony of complainant-Ghanshyam Dass has already been recorded. He further urges that since trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody further and she may be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing instant petition has vehemently argued that keeping in view seriousness of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the contents of petition.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is in custody since 19.03.2020; that petitioner is no more required by the Investigating Agency for investigation purpose; that *Challan* has already been presented in Court and since consequent trial of the case would take sufficient time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody further, thus, she deserves the concession of bail.

In view of above, instant petition for grant of regular bail moved by petitioner-**Rani Verma @ Neha @ Divya** is allowed and she is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing personal bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of Trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, Fatehabad, as the case may be.

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

20.08.2021

Varinder Prashad

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No