

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

CRM-M-37604-2022 (O & M)

Date of decision: 30.08.2022

Soni

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate and
Mr. Man Mohit Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG, Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-30452-2022

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-37604-2022

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.198 dated 29.05.2021, registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak, under Sections 306 and 34 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the daughter-in-law of Satpal, who committed suicide on 28.05.2021; that marriage of the petitioner and Sunny-son of the deceased, was solemnized on 22.11.2020; that as per the suicide note, Satpal had committed suicide for the reason that the petitioner had left the matrimonial home; that out of total four accused arraigned in the present case, co-accused namely Gangaram, Sundra and Inderpal have since been granted the concession of bail by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Rohtak, and that the petitioner has been in custody since 01.03.2022. On this premise, learned counsel prays that the petitioner be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that name of the petitioner has specifically been mentioned in the suicide note; that owing to the torture and harassment caused by the petitioner that she would implicate the deceased and his family members in some false case, he came under depression and had committed suicide.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is the daughter-in-law of the deceased. As per the suicide note, Satpal (since deceased) committed suicide for the reason that the petitioner had left the matrimonial home and also threatened to implicate the deceased and his family members in a false case.

The petitioner has been in custody since 01.03.2022. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. As stated above, the co-accused have since been granted the concession bail. Trial is unlikely to conclude any time soon. Therefore, 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 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.

30.08.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No