



CRM-M-6343-2026

-1-

210

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

CRM-M-6343-2026

Date of Decision:- 19.03.2026

Nitin

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Ms. Apoorva Walia, Advocate
for Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashwani Bhatia, AAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner – Nitin has filed 3rd petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 119 dated 23.03.2025 under Section 96, 137(2), 65(1) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 6 POCSO Act, 2012 registered at Police Station Bhiwani Sadar, District Bhiwani, Haryana (Annexure P-1).

2. As per the facts of case, complainant 'RS' gave his statement that his elder daughter 'A' is aged about 17 years. On the intervening night of 22/23.03.2025, entire family went to sleep. At about 03:00 am, his wife noticed that victim 'A' was not present on her bed. They started searching for her. He strongly suspected that Nitin has allured his daughter and she absconded with him. With these allegations, present FIR was registered.



During investigation, on 25.03.2025, victim was produced by complainant. Her statement was recorded under Section 183 BNSS, 2023 and was medically examined. Accused was arrested on 25.03.2025. After completion of investigation, challan is presented in Court.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that present FIR has been lodged on account of some misunderstanding. Allegations levelled against him are false. Earlier, he had filed regular bail petition bearing CRM-M-40076-2025, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 30.09.2025 (Annexure P-7) and second regular bail petition bearing CRM-M-59289-2025 was also withdrawn on 14.01.2026 (Annexure P-8). All material prosecution witnesses did not support allegations. Statements of victim, father of victim and mother of victim have been recorded as PW-4 to PW-6, which are Annexures P-2 to P-4 respectively, where they did not support prosecution evidence. Without considering this factual position, his second regular bail application was declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani vide order dated 06.10.2025 (Annexure P-5). Petitioner will abide by terms of bail order. It is prayed that his regular bail petition may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. It is pointed out that at the time of commission of said offence, victim was minor. She was recovered after two days. Trial in this case is under progress. After framing of charges, prosecution evidence is being recorded. It is confirmed that victim and her parents did not support prosecution case.

5. I have considered the aforesaid factual position. Case is pending for remaining prosecution evidence. Petitioner is behind the bars since



CRM-M-6343-2026

-3-

25.03.2025. Trial in this case may take some time. Testimonies of material witnesses as referred above have been recorded. Evidence on record will be appreciated by trial Court at appropriate stage. No purpose would be served by keeping petitioner behind the bars for indefinite time period. Therefore, without expressing my mind on the merits of case, regular bail petition filed by petitioner Nitin is allowed. He is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Judge concerned.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

19.03.2026

lalit

**(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No