

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

**CRM-M-15835 of 2022(O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.08.2022**

Bimla Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

**Present:- Mr. Rohit Joshi, Advocate
 For the petitioner.**

Mr. Harpreet Kaur, AAG Haryana.

**Mr. Kanwal Goel, Advocate
 For the complainant.**

KARAMJIT SINGH, J.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in case having FIR No. 724 datd 19.12.2021, registered under Sections 147, 148, 323, 506, 325 and 307 IPC at Police Station Mujessar, Faridabad.

The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner who is aged about 64 years and is a lady, has been falsely implicated in the present case. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that the entire family of the petitioner has been roped in the present case by the complainant, who is her neighbor. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation with the police in the light of the order

of interim bail dated 19.04.2022 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

The State counsel has not refuted the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation. The State counsel further submits that the petitioner is not required by the police for any further investigation or custodial interrogation, as after the completion of investigation the police has presented the challan against the petitioner and some other accused persons.

The present petition is resisted by the counsel for the complainant who vehemently argued that the accused persons including the petitioner caused injuries to the complainant party. The counsel for the complainant further submits that one of the accused namely Saurabh is still absconding. The counsel for the complainant further submits that in view of the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of injuries caused by the accused persons, the petitioner is not entitled to get concession of anticipatory bail.

I have considered the submissions made by the counsel for the parties.

Undoubtedly, the petitioner is a lady aged about 64 years and no specific injury has been attributed to her. The petitioner has joined the investigation and now is not required by the police for any further investigation as has been stated by the State counsel. The police has already presented the challan against the petitioner, after the completion of investigation. So, no purpose is going to be served, even if at this stage the petitioner is sent to custody.

In the light of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case the present petition is allowed and the order of interim bail dated 19.04.2022 is hereby made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

29.08.2022

Jiten

**(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No