



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

(214)

**CRM-M-20425-2026  
Date of Decision: 22.04.2026**

RANJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH**

Present: Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yadwinder Singh, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 of BNSS (corresponding Section 439 of Cr.P.C.) has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 14 dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 65(2), 204, 351(2), 3(5) BNS (corresponding Sections 376AB, 170, 506, 34 IPC), Sections 6 & 17 of POCSO Act and Section 75 of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, registered at Police Station Women Cell, S.A.S. Nagar, Punjab (subsequently added Section 3(5) of BNS, Section 17 of POCSO Act and Section 75 of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act vide General Diary No.7 dated 21.04.2025).

2. The translated version of the FIR is reproduced below:-

*"Copy of application, "To Station House Officer, Police Station Mahila, District S.A.S. Nagar, Mob No. 91156-5xxxx, Subject: For committing obscene act with my three and a half year old daughter xxxx by Ranjit Singh son of Hare Ram, Village Bhikhi, District Mansa, currently resident of Village Kumbra near Sector 68, District S.A.S. Nagar and xxxx (my wife). Respected Sir, I request that I Vishal Mehra son of Raj Kumar, resident of Mona Khurd, District Hoshiarpur, currently resident of House No. 3204, New Sunny Enclave, near Kamboj Hospital, Kharar. My marriage took place on 17 April 2021 with xxxx at Hoshiarpur. I and xxxx*



*already knew each other. It was a love marriage, which took place with the consent of parents. After marriage, on 27 October 2021, a daughter was born at my home, whom gave a name as xxxx, who was born premature and is now three and a half years old. We have been living in Kharar Mohali for the last 13-14 years. I want to inform you. My office is at Visa Stone in Sector 36, Chandigarh, where I am working for the last 5-6 years. One day, my wife xxxx called Ranjit Singh to my home in Kharar and introduced him to me and said this is my childhood friend, nowadays living in Mohali. Then he started visiting my house frequently. I objected several times to my wife about his coming to our house, then she would quarrel with me and say that he loves our daughter Harnaaz a lot, that's why he comes to meet her. One day when I came home from office, he was sitting at my home and using phone. My daughter was sitting on the bed. He was watching pornography on his phone. At that time my wife was working in the kitchen. When he saw me, he switched off his phone and said, "Brother, you came early today." He immediately turned off the phone. After he left, I talked to my wife xxxx that this person is not right. He was watching dirty videos sitting near xxxx. Then she said that you are under some misunderstanding, there is nothing like that. But I was not feeling right. Then on 4 February 2025, I went to U.K. regarding office work. Then my wife xxxx called me saying that the known boy Ranjit who often comes to our house seems right for conversation and he needs work. On request of my wife, I hired him for work. After 7 or 8 days, he started coming for work. When I opened my office camera next day, I saw that my wife was also coming there. Then I asked her, "Did you go to office today?" She said, "I go to office after you, until you return from U.K." Then I got suspicion when I was sitting in U.K. and checked the camera of my home. When I checked the home camera, it was mostly turned off. During those days, when I asked my wife about the camera, and when I asked the reason for the cameras being turned off, she kept giving evasive answers. During those days, I was in the UK and sent a mechanic to the house to fix the cameras. Even then, the cameras would work one day and stop the next. One day, when the cameras were working, I saw that Ranjit Singh had come to my house. Immediately after that, the cameras stopped working again. I became suspicious that something wrong was going on. On February 10, 2025, I returned to my house from London. My wife's behavior had changed significantly, but I continued treating her as usual. Then, on the morning of February 14, 2025, while she was asleep, I checked her phone and was shocked to find obscene videos of her engaging in sexual acts with Ranjit Singh. These acts were taking place in front of my 3½-year-old daughter. Watching this made me extremely disturbed. Thereafter, there were major conflicts in our home. I called my brother-in-law Sukhbir Singh, who came and took her away. I kept possession of my wife's phone, despite her repeated attempts to retrieve it. My daughter xxxx was visibly traumatized by all this. I then called my mother to come stay with my daughter. My daughter xxxx behavior had also changed significantly. When my mother lovingly asked her what happened, she replied, "Ranjit Uncle is very bad. He used to do dirty things with me and Mama (mother). He put his*



*private part in my mouth, touch my private parts, and show me dirty videos and cartoons on his phone. All of us used to watch them together. Mama also used to say, 'Enjoy baby.' Ranjit Singh and my wife were also planning to kill me, which I can prove with recordings that I will present to you. Both of them used to engage in sexual activities in front of my daughter and record vulgar videos, which has severely affected my child mentally. When Ranjit Singh found out that I had this evidence, he began threatening me over the phone, saying that if I filed any complaint against him or Hardeep Kaur, he would kill me and my daughter. He is employed as an ASI (Assistant Sub-Inspector) in Punjab Police, and I will present his photo to you. I also want to inform you that Ranjit Singh possesses illegal weapons and has connections with gangsters. My wife and Ranjit Singh also stole several belongings from my home, including my gold chain, earrings, and Rolex watch. They have betrayed the trust of both me and my daughter. Even some of my important documents have gone missing and were stolen by them. I request that I be given justice, and appropriate legal action be taken against them."*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR on the basis of the statement made by the father of the minor prosecutrix, alleging commission of obscene acts with minor prosecutrix by the petitioner. It is submitted that the nomination of the petitioner in the present case is for the sole reason that he was well acquainted with the complainant's wife, co-accused Hardeep Kaur, with whom the complainant has strained martial relations. Learned counsel contends that there is no evidence on record to substantiate the sweeping allegations of sexual misconduct leveled against the petitioner. Infact, the complainant himself had refused to get the minor prosecutrix medically examined. Moreover, the mother of the complainant, who claimed to have been informed about the alleged acts of the petitioner by the minor prosecutrix, admitted to have never seen the petitioner at the time of her testimony. Learned counsel further submits that the material witnesses stand examined in the present case. Furthermore, the co-accused has also been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court on 09.03.2026 vide CRM-



M-26526-2025. The petitioner has undergone custody of 1 year and 27 days. There is no other case registered against him.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned State counsel states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 1 year and 27 days. The learned State counsel, on instructions from the investigating officer concerned, submits that in the present case, charges were framed on 10.07.2025 and out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, 12 have been examined till date and 02 have been given up. Learned State counsel submits that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

5. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. Before proceeding further, a gainful reference can also be made to the observations passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sanjay Chandra v. CBI, (2012) 1 SCC 40***, relevant paras whereof reads thus:

*"21. In bail applications, generally, it has been laid down from the earliest times that the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment, unless it is required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be*



*innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty.*

*22. From the earliest times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some unconvicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, "necessity" is the operative test. In this country, it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances."*

7. Reverting to the case in hand, it is borne out from the record that charges came to be framed on 10.07.2025. 12 out of 22 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined till date and 02 have been given up. The pace of the proceedings, thus, indicates that the conclusion of the trial is not imminent. The petitioner has already remained in actual custody for a period of 1 year and 27 days.

8. While the truthfulness or otherwise of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the culpability, if any, would be tested and determined on the touchstone of evidence during the course of trial, the parameters governing the grant of bail necessitate a balanced consideration of the nature of accusation, the stage of the trial, the antecedents of the accused, and the likelihood of his absconding or influencing the course of justice.

9. Presently, no material has been placed on record to suggest that the petitioner poses a flight risk or that his release would impede the fair conduct of the trial, particularly when the material witnesses stand examined. Therefore, upon taking into account all the considerations stated hereinbefore,



and without expressing an opinion on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the trial, this Court is of the opinion that the continued detention of the petitioner, in the backdrop of the pace of the proceedings and the substantial period of incarceration already undergone, would not advance the cause of justice. The guarantee of personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which includes the right to a speedy trial, obliges the Court to ensure that pre-trial incarceration does not assume a punitive character. The prolonged incarceration, without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future, would also run contrary to the settled legal principle that 'bail is the rule and jail is the exception', as reaffirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another (2018) 3 SCC 22***.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed, and to ensure that the interests of justice are adequately safeguarded, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail upon furnishing of adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, subject to the following terms and conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness(s).
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused of, or for commission of which he is suspected.



(v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

11. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail before this Court.

12. It is reiterated that the observations made in hereinabove are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition, and must not be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(KIRTI SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**April 22, 2026**

*Ritika*

*Whether speaking/reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*