

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

237

CRM-M-17193-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.08.2022

MONIKA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Yadav, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.147 dated 20.04.2021, registered at Police Station Kotwali, District Faridabad, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 201 and 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.12.2021; that the petitioner, who runs a beauty parlour, has falsely been implicated in the present case; that all the offences are triable by a Magistrate; that out of Rs.23 lakh allegedly received by the petitioner, she had already transferred an amount of Rs.17 lakh in the bank account of co-accused, namely, Sunil and that the remaining amount had been adjusted against the amount

given by her to the aforesaid co-accused for sending her daughter abroad. He further submits that the petitioner has also made the payment of Rs.8 lakh and some gold jewellery to the complainant and that the aforesaid co-accused has since been granted the concession of regular bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide order dated 18.06.2022.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel and the learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that the petitioner had actively participated in the occurrence. He further submits that challan has since been presented.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 24.12.2021. Co-accused has already been enlarged on bail. As per the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has repaid some amount and jewellery to the complainant. Most of the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. In such circumstances, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, 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 learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

24.08.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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