



-1-

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

209-1

CRM-M-24699-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.08.2025

POOJA RANI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. Sumit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure seeking regular bail in FIR No.151 dated 31.08.2023 under Sections 363/366-A IPC and 3/4 of POCSO Act and Section 376 IPC and 6 of POCSO Act (added later on) registered at Police Station City Jalalabad, District Fazilka, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner has enticed the victim to take her to Ludhiana on the pretext of a job to work in a factory. However, the co-accused namely Badal is the one who had committed the alleged offence. The victim was later on recovered from the house of the said co-accused. However, the petitioner is stated to have no role in the offences as alleged in the aforesaid FIR apart from accompanying the victim to Ludhiana.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has undergone custody period of more than 01 year and 11 months and out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.



-2-

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that out of 16 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that as of date, the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 01 year 11 months and 16 days; out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far; also conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

18th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No