



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

CRM-M-58249-2025 (O&M)
Reserved on: 28.10.2025
Pronounced on: 29.10.2025

PARDEEP NEGI @ PRADEEP NEGI **...Petitioner**

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER **...Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Arun Chaudyary, Advocate (through VC)
and Mr. Kirpal Singh Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 634 dated 18.09.2023 under Section 10 Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, and Sections 323, 506 Indian Penal Code, Police Station Palla, Faridabad. Offence under Section 354-A IPC was added later on at the time of framing of charge. This is the first petition for regular bail.

FIR was registered on complaint of one 'C', who stated that on 17.09.2023, at about 10.30 PM, she and her daughter, aged 11 years were returning home from Sunday market. When they reached *gali* No. 26, Pardeep Negi son of Kamal Singh Negi, came from behind, pulled her daughter's pant and her underpants and put his mouth on her daughter's back. Her daughter raised cries upon which Pardeep ran away. Her husband went to the house of Pardeep to lodge protest. He was beaten up and threatened with death.

**CRM-M-58249-2025 (O&M)****-2-**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case was false and petitioner had been falsely implicated. Allegations in the FIR were vague and no incident as alleged ever took place. He further submits that father of the prosecutrix had attacked the petitioner at 10.30 PM. The police was called, petitioner and father of the prosecutrix were both taken to the police station. Later on, the matter of scuffle was converted to a case under the POCSO Act only to teach petitioner a lesson. He further urged that even prosecutrix conceded in cross-examination that petitioner bit her father's cheek, upon which they made a call to the police and thereafter, police called all of them including the accused, his brother and father in the police station. It was further argued that petitioner was in custody for the last more than 02 years and there were several contradictions in statement of the prosecutrix. Therefore, petitioner who had clean antecedents deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has placed on record custody certificate and argued that prosecutrix, when appeared in the witness box, fully supported prosecution case. She was eleven years old, whereas petitioner was 32 years old. Allegations were serious and specific, therefore petitioner did not deserve to be enlarged on regular bail.

As per custody certificate, petitioner is behind bars for the last more than 02 years and 01 month. Prosecutrix has been examined in the case as PW-1. There is now no prospect of the petitioner influencing the child victim. Antecedents of the petitioner are clean. He is not stated to be involved in any other case. There is no apprehension expressed that he will not abide by the

process of law. Considering the entire factual scenario of the case, but without commenting on the merits thereof, the petition is allowed. Petitioner-Padeep Negi @ Pradeep Negi, is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

Reserved on: 28.10.2025

Pronounced on: 29.10.2025

Ajay Goswami

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

: Yes/No

: Yes/No