



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

204

CRM-M-4264-2026

Date of Decision: 10.02.2026

MOHIT ALIAS LALA

.....PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present:- Mr. Mohit Jaggi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, AAG, Haryana.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanita, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 718 dated 18.12.2024, under Sections 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 8 of POCSO Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Mujessar, Faridabad.

2. Prosecution case, in brief, is that on 18.12.2024 at about 3:00 PM, the prosecutrix (PW-1), a minor girl aged about 16 years and studying in 12th class, was returning home on a scooter with her father after school. On reaching Gali No. 38, Sanjay Colony, Panipat, the petitioner was standing in the middle of the road. As her father slowed down the scooter, the accused caught hold of the prosecutrix's hand and started touching her inappropriately. On her father questioning him, the accused caught him by the collar, threatened to kill him, introduced himself as Mohit, a resident of that street, and fled the spot upon hearing alarm raised by the prosecutrix and the gathering crowd. On these facts, the FIR was registered and the accused apprehended forthwith.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude; only one witness (PW-1) has been examined so far; the petitioner is a young man aged about 30 years with no criminal antecedents; he has been falsely implicated in this case; and there is no risk of him absconding or tampering with evidence. He further contends that petitioner is in judicial custody since 19.12.2024.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes bail contending that the offence is grave in nature, involving molestation of the minor prosecutrix in broad daylight with overt acts of threat and violence against her father, the trial is at a nascent stage with vital witnesses including the prosecutrix, her father and possible eye-witnesses yet to be examined, the petitioner has local connections in the area of occurrence which poses risk of witness intimidation; and continued custody is necessary to ensure fair trial.

5. I have heard rival contentions and perused the record.

6. Admittedly, the prosecutrix is a minor girl aged 16 years. The allegations disclose commission of a cognizable offence under Section 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 8 of POCSO Act, 2012. The incident occurred in public view during daytime, where the petitioner not only molested the minor girl, but also threatened her father with dire consequences, indicating brazenness and potential threat to society, particularly minor girls.

7. Only PW-1 stands examined so far, and other crucial witnesses are yet to be examined. Prolonged delay in trial alone cannot be a ground for bail in heinous offences against minors, more so when the petitioner hails from the vicinity of occurrence and the prosecutrix's residence. Grant of bail at this juncture would expose witnesses to undue influence, thereby defeating the

ends of justice. The petitioner's age or clean antecedents does not matter in view of gravity of offence and the societal interest in protecting minors.

8. In view of above, there is no merit in the bail petition. The same stands dismissed.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

10.02.2026
pry

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No