



105

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

CRM-M-22972-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.05.2026

Maninderdeep Singh

..... Applicant-Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present: Ms. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate,
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

Ms. Sunita Devi, Advocate, for the complainant.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

CRM-23681-2026

Application for preponing the date of hearing in the main case
which is fixed for 11.08.2026

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed. Main case is taken on today's board itself.

CRM-M-22972-2026

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 469 dated 14.11.2025 under Sections 127(4) of the BNS, 2023 (Section 344 IPC) (Sections 64(II)M, 318(4), 340(2), 338, 336(2) of BNS added later on) (Sections 376E, 420, 471, 467, 465 IPC) and Section 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012, registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 29.12.2025. Investigation stands completed, challan has been presented and charges have been framed. It is further submitted that 29 prosecution witnesses have been cited and none has been examined so far. Reliance has also been placed upon the statement of the prosecutrix recorded under Section 183 BNSS wherein she stated that she had accompanied the petitioner voluntarily and had stayed with him with her consent.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, though not on notice, has put in appearance and submits that the complainant has no objection if the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the prosecutrix was admittedly a minor aged about 16 years, whereas the petitioner was about 31 years old. He further submits that the petitioner had allegedly taken the prosecutrix away from the lawful guardianship of her mother and kept her at different places for a considerable period. It is further argued that during investigation, material has surfaced indicating alteration of the identity particulars and date of birth of the prosecutrix in order to facilitate such stay. Learned State counsel further submits that biological samples were collected during investigation and sent for forensic examination; however, the FSL/DNA report has not yet been received. He submits that the allegations are grave in nature and the prosecution evidence is yet to commence.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and considering the nature and gravity of allegations, the age of the prosecutrix, who was admittedly a minor at the relevant time, the specific allegations attributed to the petitioner, the fact that none of the prosecution witnesses have been examined and the FSL/DNA report is still awaited, this Court does not deem it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Consequently, the present petition stands dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

29.05.2026
SN

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