

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC:055474



CRM-M-17483 of 2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 08.04.2026

Pronounced on:09.04.2026

Uploaded on:09.04.2026

Akash

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG Punjab.

Ms. Sunita Devi, Advocate for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No. 137 dated 26.07.2025, under Sections 137/87/64/65(1) of BNS (Section 361/363/366/376/365(3) of IPC and Section 4/17 of POCSO Act, Police Station City Dhuri, District Sangrur. This is the first petition for regular bail.

Father of the prosecutrix stated that he worked as a Sweeper in Municipal Council, Dhuri and his daughter aged 14 years was a student of Class-7th in Government school. Her date of birth was 23.02.2021. On 20.07.2025, a boy 'A' r/o Bazigar Basti Dhuri, took minor 'G' on his motor cycle on the pretext of an outing. He took her to Baba Balak Nath Temple in Himachal Pradesh, where he took a room on rent. 'G' was bullied and

physically abused as informed by her. The boy had ruined his daughter's life.

Legal action was prayed for.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was in custody w.e.f. 12.09.2025. Out of 10, 3 witnesses had been examined including the prosecutrix, 7 witnesses were yet to be examined. Father of the prosecutrix resiled from prosecution case and stated that his daughter left home after a quarrel with her and his wife. Trial would take long to conclude, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail submitting that petitioner, after enticing away the minor from the guardianship of the parents, took her to Baba Balak Nath Temple in Himachal Pradesh and committed penetrative sexual assault. Prosecutrix supported the case during trial. Considering the gravity of allegations, he did not deserve the concession of regular bail.

Learned counsel for the complainant has no objection to the prayer for bail.

Antecedents of the petitioner are clean. He is not stated to be involved in any other offence. He is in custody w.e.f. 12.09.2025 i.e. for the last more than 7 months. Prosecutrix and her father have been examined during the trial. There is no prospect of the petitioner influencing them or tampering with the evidence. Trial to conclude may take long. There is no reason to suspect that petitioner would evade the process of law. Further incarceration of the petitioner in the circumstances is not desirable. In the facts and circumstances of the case but without commenting on merits, petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing

adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

09.04.2026

reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No