

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

CRM-M-15633 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.04.2018

Suresh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Manoj Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ripudaman, AAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Vijender 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.221 dated 07.05.2017, registered under Sections 313 and 376 of IPC, at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonapat.

It is contended that the prosecutrix, a grown up lady and mother of four children was a consenting party. Learned counsel refers to the statement of the prosecutrix to contend that there are material contradictions in the statement in the FIR and statement recorded before the trial Court. The conclusion of trial will take a long time. The petitioner is in custody since 12.05.2017.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the

bail application.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

This is the second bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner. The first bail petition was dismissed as withdrawn, vide order dated 28.09.2017. The Court is not inclined to examine and reflect on the statement of the prosecutrix on merit. Considering the nature of offence and the age of the petitioner who is stated to be father of two marriageable daughters, the Court is not inclined to grant the relief sought.

Dismissed.

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

26.04.2018
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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