



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.29085 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 16.09.2024

Rajesh @ Raju

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: ***HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA***

Argued by:- Mr. Shiv Kumar Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Reepu Dhaman Bansal, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

By filing the instant petition, the petitioner has sought the relief of regular bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.70 dated 30.04.2023 registered at Police Station Dhand, District Kaithal, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 354, 354-A, 354-D & 506 IPC and Section 12 of the POCSO Act, 2012 (wherein the offences under Sections 201 & 325 IPC are reported to have been added and the offence under Section 354 IPC is stated to have been dropped later-on).

2. Shorn and short of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by the complainant in the subject FIR, are that the petitioner had been stalking and sexually harassing her daughter so as to pressurize her to have friendship with him and on 29.04.2023, he, along-with his co-accused, had caused injuries to her and her (complainant's) son and both her daughters and also to Parkasho, Kuldeep and Manjit.



3. Written Reply and Status-Report have already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the respective affidavits of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Head Quarters, Kaithal.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also perused the file carefully.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is behind the bars since the day of his arrest, i.e 08.01.2024 and the Challan has already been presented and the Charges have also been framed in the case and in these circumstances, he deserves the relief, as prayed for in the instant petition.

6. Learned State counsel has not disputed the afore-discussed factual position but he has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of the relief of regular bail.

7. Keeping in view the above-mentioned facts and circumstances and also the fact that the trial of the case is likely to take sufficient time to conclude and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the merits of the criminal case under reference, the petition in hand is, hereby, allowed and the petitioner named Rajesh @ Raju is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing the requisite personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

All the pending miscellaneous applications also stand disposed of.

16.09.2024

neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No