

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

CRM-M-31072-2022 (O & M)

Date of decision: 19.12.2022

Rani Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Renu Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-40724-2022

Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner does not press
the present application seeking interim bail for a period of 15 days.

Dismissed being not pressed.

CRM-M-31072-2022

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in
case FIR No.224 dated 06.08.2020, registered at Police Station Kalayat,
District Kaithal, under Sections 302, 201 and 34 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the
prosecution version, the petitioner-mother of Meenu (since deceased)
alongwith co-accused Vikas-cousin of the deceased was standing outside
the room where co-accused, Parvesh had strangulated her to death.
Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner has been in custody
since 06.08.2020 and that out of 32 prosecution witnesses, only 19

witnesses have been examined so far. Learned counsel further contends that the son of the petitioner has been in judicial custody; that her husband has also expired, and that even her two brothers, who were looking after her another daughter, have also expired. Learned counsel further contends that similarly situated co-accused, Vikas has since been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 23.08.2022 passed in CRM-M-20655-2021. Thus, on the ground of parity, the petitioner is entitled to be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that it is a case of honour killing; that the petitioner was an instrumental in killing her daughter, aged about 16-year, who was found with some other person at a distant place and was brought back home.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Though there are serious allegations against the petitioner, yet the fact remains that she has been in custody since 06.08.2020. Out of 32 prosecution witnesses, only 19 witnesses have been examined so far. As stated above, co-accused, namely, Vikas, who was also standing outside alongwith the petitioner at the time of the occurrence, has since been granted the concession of regular bail. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. Moreover, the husband of the petitioner has already expired and even her two brothers who were looking after her another daughter, have also passed away.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, 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 and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

19.12.2022
parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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