

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-9611 of 2018

Date of decision : 14.03.2018

Pardeep @ Deepu

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mrs. Kiran Bala Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Geeta.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No. 169 dated 15.06.2017, registered under Sections 363/506 IPC and Section 6 of the POCSO Act (inadvertently mentioned as Section 7 of the POCSO Act in the head note and the prayer of the petition), Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 21.06.2017 and Bharat was arrested subsequently and now the case had been adjourned for filing supplementary challan and the trial would now get delayed. Counsel further contends that the prosecutrix had been examined and her father had not supported the prosecution version and the DNA report is still pending. Counsel says that inadvertently in the title of the petition Section 7 of the POCSO Act has been mentioned whereas it should be Section 6 of the POCSO Act.

The MLR does not indicate any swelling or redness or any

other sign. The hymen is described as micro performed. The victim and the father have been examined. The DNA report and the FSL report have not been received.

The trial will take time to conclude. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on execution of adequate personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

14.03.2018

sunil

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No