

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

CRM -M-44767 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.11.2017

Pawan

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Sumit Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

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. 112 dated 02.05.2017, registered under Sections 354-B, 452, 376 and 506 of IPC, at Police Station Sadar Gohana, District Sonapat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Annexure P-1, the duly sworn affidavit by the prosecutrix to contend that the FIR in question was a result of some depression suffered by the prosecutrix. The prosecutrix has specifically stated that the petitioner did not enter her house. The petitioner is in custody since 13.05.2017

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

Heard.

Considering the version of Annexure P-1, the affidavit of the

prosecutrix and the fact that as many as 14 witnesses have been cited in the final police report, therefore, it can be safely inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, 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.

29.11.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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