

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 46276-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.01.2023

Shanti

... *Petitioner*

V/s.

State of Haryana

... *Respondent*

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present : Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, AAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No. 114 dated 03.05.2022, under Sections 120-B, 384, 389 of IPC registered at Police Station Rohtak Civil Lines, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 04.05.2022. He submits that the petitioner, who is a lady, has been falsely implicated in the present case as the main accused is one Arti, who conspired to extort money from the complainant and that there is no other case registered against the petitioner. He further submits that the challan stands presented and charges have been framed and complainant's examination-in-chief has been done and only cross-examination is pending and that the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

Custody certificate filed by the respondent-State is taken on

record.

Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, while submitting that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature but does not dispute the fact that the challan stands presented and the charges have been framed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner is in incarceration since 04.05.2022.

It is not a case made out by the respondent-State that concession of bail if granted to the petitioner would hamper the course of free and fair trial. Further, since the the challan stands presented and charges have been framed and the examination-in-chief of the complainant is complete and the trial would take sufficient time, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bars

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to her furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

18.01.2023
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes /No