



CRM-M-15491-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

CRM-M-15491-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 11.05.2026

Pronounced on: 12.05.2026

Uploaded on: 12.05.2026

RAJ KUMAR @ SONU**...Petitioner****VERSUS****UNION TERRITORY CHANDIGARH****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**Argued by: Mr. Parunjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ganesh K. Sharma, Addl. PP UT Chandigarh.

Ms. Janya Sirohi, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 114 dated 27.08.2025 under Sections 65(1) and 87 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4(2) of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, Police Station Sector 39, Chandigarh. This is the first petition for regular bail.

2. Prosecutrix M aged 15 years, a student of Class 10th, stated that her father was a driver, while her mother was an Attendant in Civil Hospital. On 26.08.2025, she was with Sonu, father of her friend Dishika, in Sector-8, Chandigarh, along with 6-7 boys and 6-7 girls in connection with some business talks. She returned to her house from Sector-8 at about 7.30 PM and at 9.30 PM, she received a phone call from Sonu, who asked her to come for five

**CRM-M-15491-2026 (O&M)****-2-**

minutes to note down construction material. She reached Jamun Chowk to meet Sonu. When she was sitting in the car and writing, Sonu asked her to come for a meeting for 5-10 minutes. When she refused, he told her that she had been selected and took her to an office in Raipur, where he hurled ₹20,000/- to ₹30,000/- on her face and asked her to establish relations. On her refusal, he forcibly made relations with her and dropped her home at 11.15 PM. She informed her mother and called 1098.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was in custody for last 08 months. Prosecutrix and her mother had since been examined during the course of trial and did not support prosecution case. As such, petitioner deserved to be released on bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail submitting that the victim in the case was a minor child, 15 years old and antecedents of the petitioner were not clean as one more case was registered against him.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 states that respondent No. 2 has no objection, in case petitioner is enlarged on bail.

6. Petitioner is in custody w.e.f. 30.08.2025 i.e. for more than 08 months. Statement of the prosecutrix and her mother have been recorded during the course of trial. They have not supported prosecution case. There can be no apprehension that once released on bail, petitioner would tamper with evidence. Pendency of one criminal case against the petitioner cannot be a ground to decline bail. Out of total 19 PWs, 13 have been examined so far. Conclusion of trial is likely to take long. Further detention of the petitioner is not warranted. In

the facts and circumstance of the case, but without commenting on merits, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

7. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

May 12, 2026

Ajay Goswami

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No