

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.26035 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision:13.07.2021

(Heard through VC)

Sanchit Chugh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Sanjiv Kumar Yadav, Advocate and
Mr. Anil Shankar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Charanjit Kaur, Advocate
for the complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

CRM No.19831 of 2021

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed
and the complainant has been ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

The amended memo of parties is taken on record and the
registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

CRM-M No.18253 of 2021

This is a petition that has been filed for grant of regular bail to
the petitioner in FIR No.272 dated 11.05.2021 registered under Sections
376(2)(n), 384 IPC and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act,
2000 at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner herein would contend that
the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the said FIR. In fact, the

allegations levelled in the FIR against the petitioner are vague as there is no mention of date, time and place of commission of offence of rape upon the prosecutrix. It is further contended that the prosecutrix alleged herself to be an employee of the petitioner, while further alleging that the petitioner had taken approximately Rs.9 lakhs, which he refused to return, however, she nowhere disclosed the source of the money she allegedly gave to the petitioner. It is also submitted that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and relies upon affidavit, which is available on record as Annexure P-2, wherein the prosecutrix-respondent No.2 stated that she has no objection in case the petitioner herein is granted bail. The trial is likely to take some time to conclude and therefore, prays for concession of bail to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State opposes grant of bail to the petitioner by contending that the allegations levelled against him are serious in nature.

At this stage appearance has been caused on behalf of prosecutrix-respondent No.2 by Ms. Charanjit Kaur, Advocate, who admits to the factum of compromise and submits that respondent No.2 has no objection if the petitioner is released on bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties. Keeping in view the fact that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and the prosecutrix-respondent No.2 has no objection in case the petitioner herein is granted bail and the fact that the trial is likely to take some time to conclude owing to COVID-19 situation, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bars. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on execution of

adequate personal/surety bond to the satisfaction of concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, any observation made herein shall not be construed to be an expression on merits of the case.

July 13, 2021
Pankaj*

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

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