

2025:PHHC:161612



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

291

CRR No. 350 of 2025 (O&M)**Date of decision: 20.11.2025****Suxxxx and another****...Petitioners****Versus****State of Haryana****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed by the petitioners against the judgment dated 09.10.2019, passed by the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Gurugram (*for short 'Board'*) in case arising out of FIR No. 212 dated 09.05.2019, registered under Section 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (*for short 'POCSO Act'*) at Police Station City Sohna, District Gurugram, whereby the petitioners, who were juveniles on the date of occurrence, were held guilty for commission of offence under Section 6 of the POCSO Act and also against the order dated 10.10.2019 passed by the Board under Section 18 of the POCSO Act, whereby the petitioners were directed to undergo detention for a period of one year. The petitioners have also laid challenge to the judgment dated 16.01.2025, passed by the learned appellate Court, whereby the appeal filed by them had been dismissed.

2. Today, learned counsel for the petitioners has made a statement so as not to press the present revision against the judgment passed by the Board

2025.PHHC.161612



holding them guilty for commission of offence punishable under Section 6 of the POCSO Act as well as against the judgment passed by the learned appellate Court. Learned counsel confines his prayer against the order passed by the Board under Section 18 of the POCSO Act, whereby the petitioners were directed to undergo detention for a period of one year. It is further submitted that petitioners are not the previous convicts nor any other case is pending against them. They were juveniles at the time of occurrence. They have already undergone substantive period of their detention. So, looking into these circumstances, the detention period of the petitioners may be reduced to the period already undergone by them.

3. Learned State Counsel has no serious objection to the aforesaid prayer. He has filed custody certificates, as per which, the petitioners have already undergone actual detention of more than 10 months awarded by the Board and upheld by the learned appellate Court and they are not involved in any other case.

4. After hearing the counsel for the parties, I uphold the judgments passed by the Board as well as by learned appellate Court as the same are based on appreciation of prosecution evidence, proving guilt of the petitioners, however, considering the fact that the petitioners have faced the agony of protracted trial, they were juveniles at the time of occurrence and they have already undergone actual detention of more than 10 months out of the period of 01 year and subsequently are not involved in any other case, which shows that they have improved their character and have joined the mainstream of the society, the order dated 10.10.2019, directing them to undergo detention for a

2025:PHHC:161612



period of 01 year, is modified to the extent that the same is reduced to the period already undergone by them.

5. The petitioners are directed to be released from detention forthwith, if not required in any other case.

6. The petition stands disposed of. Pending application, if any, shall also be treated as disposed of.

20.11.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No