

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

CRM-M-10191-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.07.2022

Jyoti

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Veena Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 262 dated 11.08.2021, registered under Sections 392, 379-B IPC and later on added Sections 435, 201 IPC, at Police Station Badli, District Jhajjar.

Status report by way of affidavit dated 08.07.2022 of the Addl. Superintendent of Police, Badli, District Jhajjar, already filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case, on the disclosure statement of co-accused-Raman Chinki, husband of the petitioner; that the allegation against the petitioner is that she caught hold of the driver of the hired car; that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.09.2021; that no recovery was effected from the petitioner and that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

She further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars along

with her husband, therefore, prays to grant regular bail to the petitioner to look after her two minor children.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime and hired the car along with her co-accused and on the way forcibly snatched the car and caused injuries by giving kick and fist blows to the complainant-driver. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner and that there is no other case against the petitioner. He submits that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 20.09.2021. The petitioner is a lady having two minor children and she was involved in the present case on the disclosure statement of the co-accused and no recovery was effected from her. Moreover, there is no other case against the petitioner. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, the conclusion of the trial would take time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail being a lady on her furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

12.07.2022
Mangal Singh

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