

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

Crl. Misc. M-8391 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: March 15, 2018

Parveen alias Pinnu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. R.S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, DAG Haryana.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.35 dated 12.06.2017, under Sections 328, 376 of Indian Penal Code, Section 4 of POCSO Act and Section 3 of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, registered at Police Station Women Kaithal, District Kaithal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner herein was taken into custody in the aforesaid FIR on 14.06.2017. It is argued that the petitioner is falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that statements of both the prosecutrix and her father have been recorded, in which the petitioner has not been identified. It is also contended that conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the

petitioner is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from Investigating Officer, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, however, does not dispute the fact that both the prosecutrix and her father have failed to identify the petitioner in their statements.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Since, the trial is likely to take some time and in view of the facts that the petitioner herein has been in custody since 14.06.2017 and that statements of both the prosecutrix and her father have been recorded, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bars. At this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on execution of adequate personal bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

March 15, 2018

vijay saini

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No