

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR

CRIMINAL PETITION No.1540 of 2016

ORDER:

The petitioners, who are accused Nos.1, 3 to 5 in S.C.No.60 of 2014 on the file of the Special Judge for Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act-cum-Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Vijayawada, preferred the application under Sections 437 and 439 Cr.P.C. seeking bail in the above sessions case. A charge sheet came to be filed against the petitioners along with others for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 376-D, 384, 354-A(ii), 354-D(i), 506 and 509 read with 34 IPC and Sections 4, 6 and 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

The allegations in the charge sheet would disclose that the petitioners along with accused No.4, are alleged to have lured 18 girls by deceitful words and then committed sexual assault on them. The statement of victim No.12 discloses that during the month of September, 2013, accused No.1 with the active support and instigation of accused No.2 followed her on the pretext of love. On one occasion accused No.2 took her photographs at the instigation of accused No.1 through his mobile and thereafter morphed the photo nude and shown the same to her. When she complained the same to accused No.1, he assaulted accused No.2 so as to attract her. Thereafter, victim No.12 believed that accused No.1 is in love with her started moving freely with him. On one occasion accused No.1 by deceitful words took LW.1 to his house and had sexual inter course with her on a false promise of marriage. Thereafter, accused No.1 has taken two sovereigns of gold chain on the pretext that he was in need of money. During the month of March, 2014 accused No.1 has taken LW.1 to his house and forced her to share bed with his friends. When she refused, accused No.1 threatened LW.1 that he is in possession of her nude photos and sexual inter course videos

and if she fails to share bed with his friend he would circulate the same to others. Thereafter, accused Nos.1,2,4 and 5 had forcible sexual intercourse with LW.1 by putting her in fear of circulation of the nude photos and videos. Basing on these allegations the above charge sheet came to be filed.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

It is brought to the notice of the Court by the learned Public Prosecutor that the entire trial in the said case is complete and the case is posted for arguments. But the same is disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioners stating that the case is only coming for examination of the Investigating Officer and there is no progress since then.

The allegations made in the charge sheet being grave and as the trial in the said case is almost complete, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Hence, the request of the petitioners is rejected. However, the trial Court shall dispose of S.C.No.60 of 2014 as early as possible, preferably within a period of two (02) months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

With the above direction, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

C. PRAVEEN KUMAR, J

16.02.2016

gkv