

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

CRM -M-24939 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.07.2017

Alam

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.S. Chatrath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Jagdev Singh.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No. 29 dated 20.05.2016, registered under Sections 363, 366-A, 376 of IPC and Sections 4 and 6 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, at Police Station Nurmahal, District Jalandhar.

The learned counsel refers to the statement of prosecutrix Annexure P-2 to contend that the prosecutrix has not supported the case of the prosecution. Even in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., she asserts that she is major. The petitioner is in custody since 22.05.2016.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application.

Heard.

Considering the statement of the prosecutrix whereby she admits that she had gone with the petitioner with her own wish and the fact that petitioner is in custody since 22.05.2016; the conclusion of trial will take a long time, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of CJM/Duty Magistrate/trial Court.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.07.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No