



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

**CRM No.15305 of 2026 in/and
CRM-M No.5940 of 2026
Date of decision: 23.04.2026**

Jagjit Singh @ Jaggi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate and
Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gurjant Singh Swaich, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

CRM No.15305 of 2026

This application has been filed under Section 528 BNSS
(corresponding Section 482 Cr.P.C.) seeking preponement of the main case
bearing CRM-M No.5940 of 2026 from 05.05.2026 to some earlier date.

For the reasons mentioned in the present application, the same
is allowed and the main case is taken on the Board today itself.

CRM-M No.5940 of 2026

1. This is a petition for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case FIR No.02 dated 03.01.2026 registered under Section 143 of BNS,
2023 and Section 81 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of



Children) Act, 2015 at Police Station Doraha, District Khanna (Ludhiana).

2. The allegations in the FIR are that the petitioner took custody of minor Jasneet Kaur from the complainant on 02.03.2024 on the pretext of taking care of the child after giving some money to the complainant and thereafter, did not disclose her whereabouts. It is further alleged that he, later, demanded an amount of Rs.6,20,000/- from the complainant for return of the child and stated that the child had already been handed over to another person.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and the allegations are misconceived. It is submitted that the complainant, after the demise of his wife, was not in a position to take care of his minor child and had himself approached the petitioner and the family of Mandeep Singh for adoption of the child. It is further submitted that the child was given in adoption and a proper ceremony was also performed in the presence of family members. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody since 03.01.2026 and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars any further. It is further contended that Mandeep Singh, to whom the child is alleged to have been handed over, has already been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court and, therefore, the case of the present petitioner deserves similar consideration.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the prayer for bail and submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, being the person who allegedly took the child from the complainant and facilitated



handing over of the child. However, it is not disputed that Mandeep Singh has already been granted interim anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is in custody since 03.01.2026. The material on record, at this stage, indicates that the complainant had lost his wife and was left with a minor child of tender age and was facing difficulty in taking care of the child. The version put forth on behalf of the petitioner that the child was given in adoption to co-accused Mandeep Singh and his wife by complainant and a ceremony was performed is, *prima-facie*, supported by the photographs placed on record. It is also significant that there is a delay of about two years in lodging the FIR, which has not been satisfactorily explained. Furthermore, Mandeep Singh, to whom the child is alleged to have been handed over, has already been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody and no further custodial interrogation appears to be necessary.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, but considering the period of custody of the petitioner, the nature of allegations, the delay in registration of the FIR, and the fact that the co-accused has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty



Magistrate and subject to his complying with the conditions as envisaged under law.

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

23.04.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No