



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

CRM-M-17975-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:06.05.2025

Dilpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Ms. Manju Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Chanchal K. Singla, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0176 dated 13.12.2024 under Sections 137(2) and 87 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Nehianwala, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for 4 months and 3 days and that the investigation in the present case has been completed and thereafter challan has also been presented. She submitted that as per the allegations the petitioner allegedly enticed away the daughter of the complainant, who was 17 years and 10 months old at the time of the incident i.e. two months short of attaining the age of majority and marriage. However, she further submitted that when the prosecutrix was recovered after three days, she stated in her statement recorded under Section 183



BNSS, that she had gone with the petitioner of her own free will. She also submitted that there was a friendship between the petitioner and daughter of the complainant. She further asserted that the petitioner has already faced incarceration for about 4 months and 3 days and the investigation has been completed and therefore the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel submitted that insofar as the custody of the petitioner is concerned, the same is correct and the investigation in the present case has already been completed and challan has also been presented. He however submitted that allegations against the petitioner are pertaining to enticement of a girl of the age of 17 years and 10 months and the same are serious in nature and therefore the petitioner is not entitled for grant of regular bail.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

5. The custody of the petitioner has come out to be 04 months and 03 days and as per both the learned counsels for the parties, the investigation in the present case has already been completed and the challan has also been presented. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, in the statement recorded under Section 183 of BNSS, the prosecutrix stated that she had gone with the petitioner of her own consent and due to their friendship. Furthermore, it is neither the case of the learned State counsel nor it has been argued that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond, flee from justice, influence witnesses or tamper with evidence. Therefore, considering the aforesaid totality of the circumstances



in the present case, this Court deems it fit and proper to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

06.05.2025

shweta

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