

2025:PHHC:076719



215 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32746-2025 (O&M)
Decided on:-25.06.2025

Anchal

....Petitioner..

vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Shokeen Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Sandhu, AAG, Punjab (thr. V.C.)

Mr. Pradeep Sehrawat, Advocate,
for the complainant (Thr. V.C.).

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.41 dated 23.03.2024, registered under Section 346 IPC and later on added Section 363, 366-A, 376 and 120-B IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act, 2012, at Police Station Kotwali Nabha, District Patiala, wherein the petitioner was initially not named in the FIR as an accused, however, was later nominated on the basis of statement of Samiriti (daughter of the complainant) recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. to the extent that it was the petitioner, who gave her Rs.10,000/- in the process of having eloped with the main accused, namely, Sahil Verma.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner merely happens to be an elder cousin sister of Samiriti and on her asking, she helped her by giving Rs.10,000/- but never helped her in eloping with Sahil Verma. He further submits that petitioner is a young girl of 25 years of age and is not connected with the offence in hand and she has been pursuing her job at Hyderabad from where she was arrested on 27.05.2025 and is behind the bars for the past around 01 month.

3. On the other hand, prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been vehemently opposed at the instance of learned State counsel while referring to the allegations levelled in the FIR, besides, the statement of Samiriti, which was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., wherein, she stated that she was helped for a sum of Rs.10,000/- by the present petitioner.

4. 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.

5. At best, the only allegation made against the petitioner is that she helped Samiriti by giving a sum of Rs.10,000/- to her being elder cousin sister. The petitioner happens to be a young lady of 25 years of age pursuing her job at Hyderabad and apparently has no active role in the offence in hand. Moreover, even complainant-Harpal Singh has given his own affidavit dated 02.06.2025, wherein, he also reiterates that petitioner has no connection of any kind in the FIR in question. Besides it, the investigation in the present case already stands concluded against Sahil Verma and the charges even stood framed against him and the trial is likely to take some time. The petitioner is in custody for the past 01 month and is not involved in any other case. In such circumstances, this Court does not find any

justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

6. In view of the above, but without commenting upon merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing adequate bail bonds / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

25.06.2025

sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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