

220.

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

CRM-M-9785-2019

Date of decision:07.03.2019

SATYAWAN

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.116 dated 20.09.2018 registered under Sections 354-A, 354-D, 506 IPC and Section 8 of POCSO Act, at Police Station Women, Panipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is in custody since 02.10.2018. Even otherwise, the offences under the POCSO Act are not attracted in the case and there is no physical contact of the petitioner with the prosecutrix in any manner. The allegation against the petitioner is that he used to follow the prosecutrix and has given threat that he will destroy her career.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sudarshan, does not dispute the custody. However, she states that as the petitioner used to harass the prosecutrix and follow her with a bad intention, he is not

entitled for the concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner in custody since 02.10.2018. There is no allegation of any outraging modesty or rape. The allegation against the petitioner that he used to follow the prosecutrix with bad intention, is still a matter to be established during trial. Accordingly, this Court finds that the petitioner deserves to be admitted on bail.

Accordingly, present petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

07.03.2019
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No