

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

CRM No. M-37820 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 30.10.2017.

Manjeet @ Tinku

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG Haryana.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

This is third bail application filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C seeking bail in case FIR No.1184 dated 27.08.2015 registered under Sections 366, 376-D, 328, 342, 506, 376(2)(n), 384 and 120-B IPC at Police Station City, District Panipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the only allegation against the petitioner is that the premises were used by the co-accused for the act alleged to have been committed by the co-accused. He further states that the complainant was in touch with the co-accused whereas, the petitioner being owner of the Dhaba has nothing to do with their relationship. He is in custody since 31.08.2015. It is further contended that the complainant/prosecutrix has been examined.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application. It is submitted that the petitioner would inform co-accused Pinki who would further call the prosecutrix.

Heard.

Considering the fact that the challan stands already presented; the petitioner is in custody since 31.08.2015 and; the fresh circumstance that the complainant has been already examined; so, without commenting on the merits of the 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 trial Court/duty Magistrate concerned.

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

30.10.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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