



213 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-2326-2025

Date of Decision: 19.11.2025

CHILD IN CONFLICT WITH LAW L

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. J.K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by HC Baljinder Singh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 02.09.2025 passed by Ld. Judge, Children's Court, Mansa vide which the application for anticipatory bail moved by the petitioner-child in conflict with Law 'L' has been rejected in case FIR No.15 dated 26.01.2025 registered at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa, under Sections 118(1), 190, 191(3) of BNS (Sections 190, 191(3) of BNS deleted later on).

2. On 23.09.2025, the following order was passed:-

"The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 02.09.2025 passed by Ld. Judge, Children's Court, Mansa vide which the application for anticipatory bail moved by the petitioner-child in conflict with Law 'L' has been rejected.

Notice of motion. Mr. G.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Status report by way of an affidavit of Sikander Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Budhlada, District Mansa filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated. One kirpan blow is attributed to him, which has been caused to the victim but the injury is simple in nature. He being a juvenile, is entitled to be released on bail



irrespective of the nature of offence. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. Adjourned to 19.11.2025 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;*
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

4. Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 23.09.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.
5. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 23.09.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.
6. Disposed of.
7. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

19.11.2025
Priyanka Thakur

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