

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-39509-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-15.3.2021

Raj ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gagandeep Singh Bajwa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Ramesh Kumar.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.201 dated 28.11.2019 at Police Station A-Division Amritsar City under Sections 307, 380, 342, 436 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Jagdeesh Raj, wherein it is alleged that on 21.11.2019 he alongwith his son Kunal Arora and their domestic helper Raj daughter of Babu Masih were the only persons present in their house. His son left for office and he lay down in his room being unwell. The door of his room was locked from outside by Raj and she set the house ablaze with petrol lying in the house in an attempt to kill him. However, the

residents of the locality rescued him by breaking the door. It is alleged that their house was damaged to a great extent. Later upon checking the CCTV cameras installed at Anandpur Ashram opposite to their house, they noticed that Raj was keeping something outside the house after opening the main gate and thereafter after locking the gate from inside she jumped the wall alongwith her belongings. It is further alleged that later it was found that an amount of ₹5 lakhs, which had been kept in the almirah, was also missing.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that infact on the day of occurrence i.e. on 21.11.2019, she was present in Panchkula and had solemnized marriage with one Pawan as would be evident from the certificate Annexure P-3. It has further been submitted that immediately after solemnizing marriage she as well as Pawan approached this Court seeking protection after engaging a counsel and that the said petition was disposed off on 25.11.2019 (Annexure P-4). It has thus been submitted that the petitioner was never present at the spot.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and her presence is also substantiated from CCTV footage, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last more than 5 months and is not stated to be involved in any other case.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and while keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is a lady and has been behind bars since

the last more than 5 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

15.3.2021

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No