

207

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.39349 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.07.2021

Rakhi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short 'Cr.P.C.') in FIR No.53 dated 17.02.2020, for offence punishable under Sections 346, 302, 120-B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC') registered at Police Station Mundkati, District Palwal.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the FIR was registered on the statement of Rajesh Sharma, with the allegations that on 13.02.2020, his younger brother Ravi went away from home and they were searching for him but could not find him. The FIR also gave the description and clothes worn by Ravi. Later on, on 20.02.2020, the police party found the dead body of the deceased in a forest area of village Sondh. Thereafter, the police initiated proceedings under Section 174 Cr.P.C. and recorded the statement of 02 persons namely Vishnu Kumar and Ashok Kumar under Section 175 Cr.P.C. wherein Vishnu Kumar stated that his brother/deceased was a drug addict and

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

due to intoxication, he may have died after falling into the well. Similar was the statement made by Ashok Kumar, another brother of the deceased – Ravi.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that on 11.03.2020, the police recorded the supplementary statement of Rajesh Kumar under Section 161 Cr.P.C. in which for the first time, it is stated that he suspect that the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala and the petitioner – Rakhi may have kill Ravi and thrown his body into well. The ground for suspicion was stated to be a fight between the deceased and both the accused and for that reason, they might have killed him.

Counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that thereafter, the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala were arrested and the police recorded his confessional statement.

Counsel for the petitioner has also argued that as per the disclosure statement of the co-accused – Hem Dutt @ Lala, it is stated that as per the plan with the petitioner, in order to take revenge of the enmity with Ravi, he called him on 13.02.2020 and as per the pre-plan, he offered drinks to Ravi and after he was heavily drunk, he took him into the forest area of village Sondh and stopped his motorcycle near a well on the pretext of urinating and when Ravi was sitting on the edge of the well, he pushed him with intention to kill.

Later on, the petitioner was arrested and as per the own disclosure statement of the petitioner – Rakhi, it was stated that she was having an affair with the deceased – Ravi that she has developed illegitimate relations with the deceased – Ravi and they were involved in each other. Hem Dutt @ Lala used to visit her husband Chet Ram,

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

who is an Electrician and the petitioner also developed illegitimate relationship with Hem Dutt @ Lala. On coming to know the same, the deceased – Ravi started threatening the petitioner and on that pretext, the petitioner – Rakhi and Hem Dutt @ Lala prepared a plan to kill Ravi. It is further submitted that except this disclosure statement, there is no other evidence against the petitioner.

It is further submitted that the petitioner is the first offender and whether she had a meeting of mind with the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala, will be a matter of evidence/trial. It is also submitted that it is own case of the prosecution that at the time when the incident took place, when Hem Dutt @ Lala allegedly pushed the deceased into a well, the petitioner was not present and the allegations against her are only of conspiracy prior to that, which again will be a matter of trial/evidence.

Counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that as per the affidavit filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, there are call details between the petitioner and the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala as well as the petitioner and deceased – Ravi and the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala and deceased. It is further submitted that the call details of the petitioner and the deceased given in the affidavit, the last call was made on 20.01.2020 and thereafter, there is no call detail between the petitioner and the deceased, which reflects that the petitioner was not on talking terms with the deceased after 20.01.2020 and all these points are subject-matter of the trial. It is further submitted that as per the Custody Certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 09 days and she is not involved in any other case and till date, no

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

prosecution witness has been examined.

Counsel for the State on the basis of the Custody Certificate has not disputed the factual position but opposed the prayer for bail.

Counsel for the State on the basis of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hodal, has argued that the FIR was registered on 20.02.2020 and thereafter, on 11.03.2020, the complainant gave a written complaint raising a suspicion on Hem Dutt @ Lala that he might have committed the murder of Ravi and thereafter, Section 302/34 IPC was added and Hem Dutt @ Lala was arrested and the motorcycle was recovered along with his mobile phone. It is also submitted that as per the disclosure statement of Hem Dutt @ Lala, he demarcated the place of occurrence where he has committed the murder of deceased – Ravi.

Counsel for the State has also argued that after the arrest of the petitioner on 23.07.2020, her disclosure statement was recorded in which she has stated that she was having illegitimate relationship with Ravi and the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala and in conspiracy with the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala, he committed the murder of Ravi.

In reply, counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is a resident of village Banchari, Teshil Hodal, District Palwal whereas the incident took place in village Sondh, Teshil Hodal, District Palwal, which is the native village of the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala. It is also submitted that though there are call details between the co-accused Hem Dutt @ Lala and the deceased – Ravi on the date of incident, however, there is no call details between the petitioner and the

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

deceased after 20.01.2020.

Without commenting anything on merits of the case, considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 09 days; the petitioner is not involved in any other case; the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required; no witness of the prosecution has yet been examined and the conclusion of the trial will take some time due to COVID-19 situation, this petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail of the petitioner, in case she is found involved in any other case or misusing the concession of bail, in any manner.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

02.07.2021

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No