

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

CRM-M-22311-2023

Date of decision : 17.07.2023

Rajni Rani

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

While granting interim relief to the petitioner on 8th of May, 2023, the following order was passed:

Status report by way of an affidavit of Rajat Gulia, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Radaur (Yamuna Nagar) has been filed by the State, which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that on the basis of disclosure statement made by other co-accused, namely, Aman and Arman, the present petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present FIR and the alleged recovery of the weapons has already been made from the co-accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and shall co-operate with the investigation.

Adjourned to 17.07.2023.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and on his doing so, the petitioner be released on interim bail subject to her furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR the name of petitioner Rajni Rani has come in the disclosure statement made by co-accused namely Aman and Armaan.

3. State Counsel submits that as per the status report filed there are as much as 18 calls trace between Aman and Rajni. However, he does not dispute that even as per the case of the prosecution the allegation against the petitioner is that on her asking Aman and Armaan procured the arms. It is not a case that it is the petitioner who supplied the arms.

4. Counsel for the petitioner on the other hand submits that there is nothing against the petitioner. Even if these allegations are taken to be correct on their face value the same would not constitute any offence under the Arms Act.

5. In view of above, without commenting on the merits of the case, order dated 8th of May, 2023 is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Sections 438(2) Cr.P.C.

6. The petitions stands disposed off.

July 17, 2023

Dpr

(Pankaj Jain)

Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No