



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

CRM-M-34602-2025

Date of Decision:20.08.2025

Rekha

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Sandeep Kumar Tada, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Prabhjeet Singh Sullar, Advocate with
Mr. Shailender Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to her in case FIR No.282 dated 07.10.2023 registered under Sections 120-B, 201, 302, 328, 34 and 506 IPC at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa, Haryana (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been wrongly named as an accused in the present case. Even, it has been alleged that the petitioner and other co-accused had caused the death of Sandeep, however, no post mortem examination was conducted nor any medical evidence was collected with regard to the cause of death of Sandeep in the present case. Learned counsel further submits that Bhagwan Ram @ Sethi and Ravinder Kumar, co-accused have been granted the concession of interim

anticipatory bail by this Court. Even, Sandeep and Subhash have also been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 17.12.2024 and 12.05.2025, respectively. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 07.10.2023 and is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 10 months.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and the present petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. It is an admitted fact that Subhash and Sandeep have been admitted to bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody for the last about 01 year and 10 months and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on her furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

		(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
		JUDGE
20.08.2025	Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
hitesh	Whether reportable	: Yes/No