

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

CRM-M-33398-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.08.2022

Sunita

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Govind Chauhan, 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. 162 dated 19.03.2022 registered under Sections 148, 149, 186, 332, 341, 353, 379-B IPC and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, at Police Station Civil Line Karnal, District Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a household lady and she has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the allegation against the petitioner is that she was the part of unlawful assembly but no specific role has been attributed to her; that there are total 17 accused in the FIR; that two juvenile co-accused, namely, Ankit and Vishal, have already been granted the regular bail; that the petitioner has not damaged any public property; that as far as other cases against the petitioner are concerned, she is on bail in those cases and that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. The petitioner has been in custody since 19.3.2022.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in other cases. In the present case, the petitioner has actively participated in the occurrence and along with the co-accused inflicted injuries to the police personnel and also snatched keys of the Government vehicle. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He submits that out of 13 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 19.03.2022. The petitioner is a household lady. Though the allegation against the petitioner is that she was the member of unlawful assembly, yet there is no specific allegation against her. In all other cases against the petitioner, she is on bail. 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 on her furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

04.08.2022
Mangal Singh

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