

**CRM-M-62445-2025****-2-**

presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 13.01.2025. Earlier also, the petitioner approached this Court thrice by way of filing CRM-M-54431-2024, CRM-M-4783-2025 and CRM-M-23872-2025, which were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 07.11.2024, 31.01.2025 and 01.09.2025, respectively. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present fourth petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that admittedly the case of the prosecution is totally based on the circumstantial evidence. However, the chain of the circumstances is never complete from the evidence produced by the prosecution. He submits that the dead body of the victim child has also been not recovered by the Investigating Agency till date, and, thus, it is apparent that the case is falsely planted upon the petitioner. He submits that from the CCTV footage recovered by the Investigating Agency in itself is not credible evidence for the implication of the petitioner. He submits that even the motive alleged is weak type of evidence. He further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last about 3 years. He, thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the contention made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the

**CRM-M-62445-2025****-3-**

petitioner is involved in a heinous offence. It is submitted that it has been revealed during the investigation that the petitioner had illicit relation with the mother of the victim child and the same came to the notice of the helpless child. In order to conceal his illicit relationship with the mother of the child, the child has been done to the death by the petitioner. He submits that from the CCTV footage collected, the petitioner is clearly visible wherein he is taking the child on his motorcycle. It is submitted that last seen evidence of the relevant time is a clinching evidence against the petitioner and dead body of the child also could not be searched till date. On instructions, he has submitted that out of 30 prosecution witnesses, 13 witnesses have been examined. He, thus, submits that keeping in view the gravity of offence the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case of the prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidence. However, the victim in the present case is 13 years of child. The petitioner had been alleged to have illicit relation with the mother of the victim child. CCTV footage has been taken into possession by the Investigating Agency, wherein the petitioner had been alleged to be taking the victim child on his motorcycle at the relevant time. As submitted before this Court, hereinafter, the child was never seen. Further, as submitted before this Court out of 30 prosecution witnesses, 13 prosecution have been examined so far. Simply because the petitioner had completed about 3 years of custody, is not in itself sufficient for enlarging him on bail.

Keeping in view the gravity of the offence in the present case, this Court

CRM-M-62445-2025

-4-

does not find any merit in the present petition. Thus, the same is hereby dismissed.

6. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12.11.2025	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
sharmila	JUDGE
Whether Speaking/Reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether Reportable	: Yes/No