



CRM-M-11905-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-11905-2026

Date of Decision: 16.04.2026

Suraj Singh @ Kaka

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.K.D.Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.37 dated 06.05.2025, registered under Section 506 IPC and Sections 6 and 17 of the POCSO Act, at Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per the facts of the case the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ranjit Singh. It was alleged that on 09.05.2024, at about 11:30 a.m., Jashandeep Singh @ Mota, Jashanpreet Singh and Suraj (the petitioner) took son of the complainant, namely, Harjot Singh, whose date of birth is 28.11.2013, to Jashanpreet Singh's house and forcibly did unnatural act with his son turn by turn. They also made a video of the incident and threatened his son. After the incident came in to light, parents of the abovesaid accused persons apologized the complainant in the Panchayat. However, the accused persons still kept threatening the son of the complainant. Thus, the FIR was registered to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the petitioner was arrested on 17.06.2025. Petitioner



CRM-M-11905-2026

-2-

approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, his application was declined after hearing both the sides vide order dated 27.11.2025. Earlier the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-72014-2025, however, the same was dismissed vide order 24.12.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court again by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Jashandeep Singh @ Mota and Jashanpreet Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 10.09.2025 and 05.02.2026 passed in **CRM-M-37223-2025** and **CRM-M-53992-2025**, whereby, co-accused Jashandeep Singh @ Mota and Jashanpreet Singh, respectively, have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He submits that though the said co-accused are juvenile, however, the role attributed to them are similar to that of the present petitioner. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Jashandeep Singh @ Mota and Jashanpreet Singh. 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 petitioner was arrested in this case on



CRM-M-11905-2026

-3-

17.06.2025. Co-accused, namely, Jashandeep Singh @ Mota and Jashanpreet Singh though are juveniles, however, they are on anticipatory bail and as stated the role attributed to them is at par with that of the petitioner. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 09 months & 28 days as on 15.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

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

16.04.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**