

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

**CRM-M No.8020 of 2023
Date of Decision: 02.09.2023**

Ravinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Virat Rana, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagdeep Singh Virk, Advocate,
for the complainant.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of regular bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.34 dated 21.03.2020 registered at Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala, under Sections 304-B & 120-B IPC, with the allegations that he (petitioner), along-with his co-accused, had been harassing and maltreating his sister-in-law named Laadi Kaur, (since deceased) for bringing insufficient dowry and for demanding more dowry and the cash amount which, ultimately, led to her (Laadi Kaur's) unnatural death within seven years of her marriage with the brother of the petitioner, i.e his co-accused named Sandeep Kumar.

2. Learned State counsel has submitted the Status-Report on

behalf of the respondent-State (by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Nabha, District Patiala) and the Custody-Certificate of the petitioner in the Court today and these documents are taken on the record.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel (assisted by learned counsel for the complainant) in the present petition and have also perused the file carefully.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is behind the bars since the day of his arrest, i.e 23.03.2020 and the Charges were framed against him on 02.07.2021 but out of total 19 witnesses as cited by the prosecution, only one witness named Karamjit Singh, the complainant, has been partly examined and now, the prosecuting agency has moved an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C for summoning the additional accused to face trial in the case under reference and moreover, the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case of the similar nature and in these circumstances, he deserves the relief, as prayed for in the instant petition.

5. Learned State counsel does not dispute the afore-referred factual position but he opposes the prayer of the petitioner for the grant of relief of regular bail.

6. However, keeping in view the above-discussed undisputed facts and circumstances as well as the fact that the trial of the case is likely to take considerable time to conclude and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is

allowed and the petitioner named Ravinder Kumar is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing the requisite personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

02.09.2023
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>