

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-54828 of 2023
Date of Decision:15.01.2024

Ravi @ Vicky @ Ravi Nayak Taparvashi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, DAG, Haryana

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.113 dated 25.04.2023, registered under Sections 363, 366A, 376, 506 IPC and Section 4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, at Police Station Sadar Safidon, District Jind.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 08.06.2023. He submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case as he has not committed any offence. He further submits that the investigation of the case has been completed and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has been presented to the competent

Court and therefore the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, learned DAG, Haryana, has submitted, on instructions from ESI Ramesh, that out of the total cited 18 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have already been examined. He submitted that the material witnesses, i.e. the victim and her parents have also been examined. He also submitted that the next date of hearing fixed before the learned trial Court is 20.01.2024 for the examination of the remaining prosecution witnesses. Learned State counsel has also expressed his apprehension that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may abscond from justice or he may repeat the offence. He further submitted that in view of the gravity and seriousness of the offence as committed by the petitioner, he is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. As per learned counsel for the State, out of the total cited 18 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses, including the victim and her parents, have already been examined. Furthermore, the apprehension expressed by the learned State counsel that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may abscond from justice or he may repeat the offence, cannot be ignored. Therefore, this Court does not deem it fit and proper to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner, at this stage. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

6. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and is only meant

for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

7. All pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

January 15, 2024
dinesh

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No