

205.

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

**CRM-39307-2019 IN /AND
CRM-M-50676-2019**

Date of decision: 06.01.2020

RAHUL

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

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

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

CRM-39307-2019

Prayer in this application filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is to prepone the date of hearing of the main case, which is otherwise fixed for hearing on 21.01.2020.

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed. The hearing of the petition is postponed and the same is taken on board today itself.

CRM-M-50676-2019

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.332 dated 19.10.2019 registered under Section 67 of IT Act, 2008 and Sections 354-D,

506 of IPC and Section 3(2)(v) of SC & ST Act, 1989 (amendment Act 2015), at Police Station Nissing, District Karnal.

The aforesaid FIR was registered at the behest of mother of the victim. As per the FIR, the victim was receiving phone calls and messages in filthy and abusive languages including caste related remarks.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 03.11.2019. The petitioner happens to be the cousin of Virender. Virender and the victim were otherwise known to each other as they belongs to the same village. The trial in the case is not likely to be concluded in the near future.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the custody. She states that the case is now fixed for 17.01.2020 for framing of charge.

Vakalatnama filed on behalf of complainant in court today, is taken on record. Counsel for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious. The petitioner and the co-accused have intentionally and forcibly made interference in the peaceful life of the daughter of the complainant who was not interested in making relationship with the petitioner-accused.

I have heard counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 03.11.2019, challan in the case has already been presented and trial will take sufficient time, this Court deems it appropriate to admit the petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the 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.

The observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

06.01.2020
sanjeev

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