

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-1990-2022
Decided on :28.04.2022

Gurjeet Kaur @ Geeta

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. K. S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 337 dated 20.10.2021 under Sections 307, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 read with Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is the mother of the complainant and the complainant has implicated the petitioner falsely in the present case. It is further submitted that in the present case, no injury has been caused to the complainant and even as per the prosecution case, it is the alleged paramour of the petitioner who is stated to have fired towards the complainant, although, no injury was inflicted upon him. It is contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 22.10.2021 and is not involved in any other case and the challan in the present case has already been presented and there are as many as 8 witnesses, out of whom, only one witness has been examined and thus, the

trial is likely to take time.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present application for regular bail and has submitted that it is the petitioner who had instigated the co-accused Mintu to fire at the complainant. The other facts stated by learned counsel for the petitioner have, however, not been disputed by learned State counsel.

This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paperbook.

The present case is a case of no injury and even the alleged fire shots are not attributed to the present petitioner and the petitioner is not involved in any other case and has been in custody since 22.10.2021 and there are as many as 8 witnesses out of whom, only 1 witness has been examined and thus, the trial is likely to take time.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate and subject to her not being required in any other case.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

April 28th 2022
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No