

224.

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

CRM-M-10740-2019

Date of decision: 03.04.2019

AKSHAY

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.819 dated 22.12.2018 registered under Sections 341, 506 of IPC and Section 8 of POCSO Act at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the allegations made in the FIR are false. Petitioner has never given any threat to the prosecutrix, as alleged. He further states that after completion of investigation, challan in the case was presented under Sections 363, 511, 354 of IPC and Section 10 of POCSO Act.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, states that the petitioner is not entitled for grant of bail as he used to threaten the prosecutrix.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that challan in the case has been presented, the trial in the will take sufficient long time and the petitioner is in custody since 24.12.2018, this Court deems it appropriate to admit the petitioner 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 trial Court.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

03.04.2019
sanjeev

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