



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

(210)

CRM-M-21523-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.04.2026

TINKU @ CHINKU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.446 dated 08.07.2025 under Sections 140(3) of BNS (Sections 137(2), 87 and 61(1) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat.

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

“Copy of complaint is as follows: To the SHO, P.S Chandni Bagh, District Panipat. Sir I Mohd. Nasim son of Mohd. Alameen is resident of Baitona, Police Station Barai, District Madhepur Bihar currently resident of Vidhyanand Colony Panipat as tenant. I have 9 children (5) boys (4) girls. My daughter xxxx age 17 years went away from home on 06.07.25 at around 9.00 AM in the morning without informing anyone. I and my family have searched a lot for xxxxx. She was not found, my daughter xxxxxx should be searched. Appearance-dark complexion, round face, slim body, height around 5 feet, wearing green suit and black salwar. SD Mohd. Naseem Phone No. 75495xxxxx Date 07.07.25.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the

petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case, which was initially



lodged as a missing complaint on the statement of the father of the prosecutrix. It is submitted that neither did the petitioner entice the prosecutrix, age of whom is a disputed question fact, nor did he commit any wrong act with her. There is also no cogent evidence on record to conclusive establish the guilt of the petitioner. Rather, in their testimonies before the learned trial Court, the prosecutrix and her parents have resiled from their previous statements, and while not supporting the case of the prosecution, did not level any overt allegations against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner, aged about 23 years, has already undergone an actual custody of 8 months and 27 days. There is no other case registered against him.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. He 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 8 months and 27 days. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court. The charges were framed on 29.09.2025 and out of a total of 20 prosecution witnesses, 7 have been examined. He 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, a gainful reference can 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 29.09.2025. Yet, only 7 out of 20 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined. The pace of the proceedings, thus, indicates that the conclusion of trial is not imminent. The petitioner has already remained in actual custody for a period of 8 months and 27 days. It is also not disputed that he has no criminal antecedents and is not involved in any other case.

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



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. Moreover, it is noted that the material witnesses during the course of their examination before the trial Court, resiled from their previous statements and did not support the prosecution version. While it is settled that the probative value of such testimony is a matter for appreciation at the stage of final adjudication of the case, yet, even while refraining from entering into any conclusive evaluation thereof, this factum cannot be completely overlooked. 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.

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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

April 24, 2026
Itilesh

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