

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

Crl. Misc. M-10854 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 19, 2017

Sonender @ Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG Haryana.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.23 dated 19.11.2015, under Sections 216, 376, 452 of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Women, Panipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner herein was taken into custody in the aforesaid FIR on 30.04.2017 and the challan has already been presented. It is argued that the DNA test is inconclusive, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, opposes the bail application, however, does not dispute the fact that the DNA report is

inconclusive.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Since, the trial is likely to take some time and in view of the facts that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, he is not required for any further investigation and that charges have been framed, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind the custody. At this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on execution of adequate personal bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

September 19, 2017
vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No