

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

CRM-M No.19959 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25th October, 2017

Sandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Allegations against the petitioner Sandeep Singh in this fourth regular bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.236 dated 04.10.2014 registered at Police Station Jakhal, District Fatehabad under Sections 376-D/N, 506, 34 IPC, are that as a consequence of written complaint dated 04.10.2014 present case was got registered wherein the prosecutrix alleged that she was forcibly taken away by the principal accused Sukhraj Singh alias Raj whereas the present petitioner at that time was unnamed and she has reiterated her stand in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. on 09.10.2014 before the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Tohana. Allegations against the petitioner are that he was instrumental in blackmailing the prosecutrix along with the principal accused and having clicked her nude photographs in a compromising position has tried to force her to bow to

the desires of the accused side, leading to registration of the present case and arrest of the petitioner on 26.10.2014.

Contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioner are that this Court has already stayed trial and that the petitioner is behind bars since almost three years and that neither the petitioner has been initially named and it is subsequently his name has cropped up.

The bail application is sought to be opposed with much vehemence by the learned State counsel on the grounds that the prosecutrix has named the petitioner in her stand before the Magistrate and has also identified the petitioner at the time of trial in Court and in view of the heinousness of the offence the petitioner was not entitled to any relief.

Appreciating the submissions of the two sides, learned counsel for the petitioner could not convince this Court what grounds have arisen for this fourth regular bail application except the fact that it is on the basis of a judicial order the proceedings have been stayed. Keeping in view role assigned to the petitioner, heinousness of the offence and seriousness of the allegations and there being no ground to allow the relief, impels this Court to dismiss the present petition.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

October 25, 2017

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No