

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

CRM-M-27132 of 2017(O&M)

Date of decision : 30.08.2017

Ravneet Singh @ Ravjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Mansur Ali, Advocate
and Ms. Gitika Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Karan Bir Singh, DAG, Punjab.

LISA GILL,J(Oral)

Petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR
No. 055, dated 15.03.2016, under Sections 342, 376, 363, 366-A, 376-D,
IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act, 2012, Police Station Mandi
Gobindgarh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

Contentions on behalf of the petitioner were noted at the
time of issuance of notice of motion in this case as under:-

“It is contended that the petitioner was found innocent
during investigation. He has been summoned on the
application filed under Section 319 Cr.P.C., to face trial as

an additional accused by the learned trial Court vide its order dated 16.05.2017 (Annexure P/5).

The victim in her initial version levelled allegations attracting the rigours of Section 376 IPC and Section 6 of the *Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012* against two other co-accused. No such allegations was raised against the present petition at the initial stage. However, in her statement made before the trial Court, prosecutrix took a volte-face and stated that the other two co-accused are innocent and it is only the present petitioner who is involved in the crime.”

It is submitted that the petitioner has since appeared before the learned trial Court on 09.08.2017. Certified copy of the order dated 09.08.2017 produced in Court today, is taken on record subject to just exceptions. It is submitted that the petitioner undertakes to face trial. He shall appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date fixed and not abuse the concession of bail if afforded to him. Therefore, this petition be allowed.

Learned Counsel for the State is unable to deny that the petitioner has appeared before the learned trial Court on 09.08.2017. There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioner is likely to abscond or that he is likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances noted above but without expressing any opinion on the merits of case, it is considered just and expedient to allow this petition. Consequently, interim bail afforded to the petitioner by the learned trial Court on 09.08.2017 is made absolute

subject to the petitioner furnishing fresh bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

Petition is accordingly allowed.

30.08.2017

s.khan

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable:Yes/No