



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-64499-2025(O&M)

Date of Order: 17.11.2025

Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kulwant Singh @ Kanta

.Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh. AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manish Kansra, Advocate
for respondent no.2.SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.80, dated 09.08.2024, under Section 64 Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 202, Police Station Sadar Patti, Tarn Taran. This is his first application for anticipatory bail.

Prosecutrix alleged that she was 27 years old and was married five years ago. From the marriage, she had a daughter, aged 3 years but had no son. She approached Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kanta son of Dara Singh on someones recommendation, to take his blessings for son. She along with her husband and daughter met Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kanta on 06.08.2024, at about 08:00/08:30 PM. Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kanta told her husband in confidence that for blessings of son, she would be required to take five baths and the first bath will be done at 10:00 PM that day. She was asked to come alone for baths. Believing him and for taking his blessings for son, she went with Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kanta on his scooter to a tubewell where



Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kanta, on the pretext of giving her bath, forcibly raped her. After wearing clothes, she raised alarm on which Baba Kulwant Singh @ Kanta slapped and abused her.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the matter had since been compromised with the prosecutrix. He further submits that the petitioner was 73 years old man and there was 3 days delay in registration of the FIR. Further, petitioner who had clean antecedents, was ready and willing to join investigation.

Notice of motion.

Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground of serious nature of allegations. It is pointed out that even in her statement under Section 183 BNSS, prosecutrix supported her first version.

Considering the nature and substance of allegations, the gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner, there are no extraordinary circumstances warranting exercise of discretion under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The alleged compromise deed, on record as Annexure P-2 does not bear any signatures and considering the serious nature of allegations, does not influence the Court while determining the application for pre-arrest bail. The petition is accordingly, dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

17.11.2025

nt

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No