



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-24240-2024

Date of decision : 20.05.2024

MEHAK

...PETITIONER

Versus

UT CHANDIGARH

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present : Mr. K.P.Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P. U.T. Chandigarh with
Ms. Diksha Sharma, Advocate.

Mr. Anil Mehta, Advocate with
Mr. Livleen Brar, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARKESH MANUJA.J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.21 dated 06.02.2024 registered under Section 10 of POCSO Act at Police Station Sector-11, Chandigarh, wherein the petitioner has been implicated with the allegations of having tortured and physically abused the specially abled children while being employed at Aastha Therapy Centre Sector-24, Chandigarh.
2. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant while submitting that the allegations against the petitioner were *prima facie*



established, even during the investigation from the CCTV footage collected in the house.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

4. Considering the fact that the investigation in the present case already stands concluded with the filing of challan, the petitioner being of 20 years of age who is behind bars for the last almost 3 months and 11 days and trial being likely to take some time, besides, considering the allegations made in the FIR, I do not find any reason to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

5. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

6. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

20.05.2024
monika

Whether speaking/reasoned ? Yes/No
Whether Reportable ? Yes/No