



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

213

CRM-M-35305-2025

Date of decision : 21.08.2025

Dilpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate with
Mr. G.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, D.A.G., Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.132 dated 07.10.2024 registered under Sections 64, 137(2) & 87 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3 & 4 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offence Act, 2012 at Police Station City-1, District Mansa.

2. Status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Butta Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Mansa, District Mansa, on behalf of the respondent-State, filed in the Registry is taken on record.

3. Brief facts of the case are that on 07.10.2024, mother of the victim made a complaint to the police alleging therein that on 06.10.2024, she had gone to the market of Mansa Town in relation to some domestic work. When she came back at about 8:00 P.M., her daughter was not present at home. When she inquired about her, she came to know that one Dilpreet Singh (the present petitioner) along with



unknown person enticed away her minor daughter on the pretext of marriage. On the basis of said complaint, the instant FIR was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the victim and the complainant-mother of the victim, who have been examined before the Trial Court as PW-1 and PW-2, respectively, have not supported the case of the prosecution and turned hostile. The victim in her statement recorded before the Trial Court has stated that nothing wrong was ever happened with her and nobody ever threatened her for anything. She further stated that she never suffered any statement before the police and her signatures were obtained by the police on the blank papers and her medical examination was not conducted in the hospital.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 07.10.2024 and not involved in any other case. He also submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only 02 i.e. victim and her mother have been examined so far. The trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude and therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel, while referring to the averments made in the status report, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, he

**CRM-M-35305-2025****3**

could not refute the factual position that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far. He has also filed custody certificate dated 21.08.2025 in the Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars since more than last 10 months and he is not involved in any other case.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. Keeping in view the custody period of the petitioner which is 10 months and 13 days and the facts that the victim and her mother have not supported the case of the prosecution in their statements recorded before the Trial Court and turned hostile; investigation has been completed; challan has been presented; charges have been framed and out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only 02 i.e. victim and her mother have been examined so far; the petitioner is not involved in any other case and the trial may take a considerable time to conclude, therefore, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

9. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

10. 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.

21.08.2025*kothiyal***(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No