

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

227

**CRM-M-50743-2021
Decided on : 13.12.2021**

Manoj Kumar

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. Manoj Kumar Pundir, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Daulat Ram.

Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate, for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

This is the third petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 110, dated 03.09.2019, under Sections 306, 376, 370, 328, 366, 385, 341, 216, 406, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Jathlana, District Yamuna Nagar.

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to how the instant petition could be entertained, he has failed to bring to the notice of this Court any material change in circumstances subsequent to the previous petition having been dismissed on merits on 16th October, 2020. Rather, he has simply submitted that it was a case of false implication and the petitioner was in a relationship with the deceased and hence, had no role to play in her suicide. Learned counsel has further submitted that while stepping into the witness-box as PW-2, the complainant had deposed falsely against the petitioner, as he was unhappy with his deceased daughter's relationship with the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

Prima facie there are serious allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR in question that he had been continuously raping the deceased after blackmailing and threatening her. Still further there are also allegations that the petitioner after obtaining the signatures of the deceased on blank papers had misused them by fabricating various documents including a document to show that the petitioner was in a live-in relationship with her.

In the wake of the serious and specific allegations levelled, which were reiterated by the complainant i.e. father of the deceased, when he stepped into the witness-box as PW-2, this Court does not deem it appropriate to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. Petition stands dismissed accordingly. It is, however, made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merit of the case.

At this stage, a prayer has been made by learned counsel for the petitioner for expediting the trial, as the petitioner has been in custody since 03rd September, 2019. Accordingly, the trial Court concerned is directed to expedite the trial and endeavour to conclude the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of five months from the date of this order.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

December 13, 2021

J.Ram

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