

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM M-49630-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 17.05.2019

Yogesh Abrol

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present : Ms. Rishma Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. V.G.Jauhar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.P.Soi, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has preferred the instant petition under Section 438 read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.155 dated 29.08.2017, registered under Sections 363, 366, 376, 506/34 IPC and Section 3 (r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act (in short 'the Act'), 1989, (Section 3 (r) of the Act added later), at Police Station Division No.3, Jalandhar.

It is a case of the prosecutrix that on 14.07.2017, the petitioner alongwith his associates got admitted the prosecutrix in Doaba College, Jalandhar and they helped her financially. However, on 15.07.2017, the prosecutrix went to the said college where the petitioner and his friend Karan were sitting in a car. Petitioner Yogesh Abrol demanded money

from her and she returned the same. Thereafter, the petitioner told her to sit in the car so that he may drop her at her home. But they took her somewhere else and the petitioner committed rape upon her. His friend Karan clicked her obscene photographs. They threatened her that these photographs will be got viral in college if she disclosed this fact to anybody. Under this threat, the petitioner again committed rape upon her and said Karan again clicked her obscene photographs.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

After medical examination, the vaginal swabs were sent to forensic science laboratory and it was reported that spermatozoa were detected therein. The statement of the prosecutrix under Section 164 Cr.P.C. was also recorded.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the seriousness of the offences, this court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

As such, the instant petition stands dismissed.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

17.05.2019
mamta

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