

110

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

CRM-M No.43370 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.10.2021

Nirmala

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Lalit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Manish Deswal, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.557 dated 14.08.2021 registered under Sections 306 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station City Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered on a complaint given by one Rajwanti, it is stated that on 14.08.2021, her son namely Sandeep committed suicide. It is further stated that the marriage of Sandeep was solemnized with Sonu daughter of the petitioner and later on, in the year 2019-20, a false case of demand of dowry and maltreatment was registered against Sandeep in Police Station Lakhanmajra. It is further stated that after registration of the case, the petitioner and her daughter Sonu wife of Sandeep used to threat him that he will be implicated in some other

false case and under that pressure, he has committed suicide.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the daughter of the petitioner namely Sonu/wife of the deceased Sandeep has already been arrested and she has been granted the concession of regular bail by the Court of Sessions vide order dated 04.10.2021. It is also submitted that there are no specific allegations against the petitioner except that some recovery of cash or jewellery is to be effected.

Counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that since Sonu is the wife of deceased Sonu and she has already been arrested, the police has already recovered the articles. It is also argued that from the bare perusal of the FIR, no specific allegation against the petitioner, who is the mother-in-law are made out, which abetted the deceased Sandeep in such a manner that he has no option but to commit suicide.

Counsel for the State has argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as some cash amount, etc. is to be recovered. However, it is not disputed that the wife of deceased Sonu was arrested and after her custodial interrogation, she was released on regular bail.

Counsel for the complainant has also made similar arguments that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature.

After hearing the counsel for the parties and going through the contents of the FIR and also in view of the fact that the petitioner is a lady, who is the mother-in-law of deceased Sonu and also in view of the fact that Sonu, wife of the deceased Sandeep and daughter of the

present petitioner has already been arrested and after her custodial interrogation, she has been released on regular bail, this petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Disposed of.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

13.10.2021
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No