



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

295

CRA-S-1471-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 05.05.2026

CCL AXXXX

.....APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Khushwant Saharan, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging the impugned order dated 15.04.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, whereby application for grant of regular bail to the appellant, in case, FIR No.0489 Dated 29.12.2024, Under Sections 103(1), 3(5), 351(3) of B.N.S., 2023 (corresponding to sections 302, 34, 506 of IPC), and [sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959 and section 3(2)(va) of S.C. & S.T. Act, 1989 were added later on during the investigation], registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak, was dismissed.

2. FIR in the present case was registered on the complaint of Sharda (mother of the deceased Parveen Kumar @ Punna), alleging therein that on 28.12.2024 at about 7:30 PM, after having his meal, her son Parveen Kumar @ Punna went out of his house for a walk. When he reached the nearby roundabout (chowk), 3-4 persons arrived there and attacked him with knives. Upon hearing the alarm raised by the victim,



complainant along with her husband rushed to the spot and saw that CCL 'A' (present appellant), along with Honhar @ Himanshu and Noni, were inflicting knife injuries upon their son. On seeing them, all the assailants fled from the spot on motorcycles along with their weapons.

3. During her deposition before the Court, complainant Sharda supported the case of the prosecution and specifically stated that CCL 'A' (appellant herein) and CCL 'N' were giving knife blows on the body of her son (since deceased), while CCL 'H' was assaulting him with kicks and fists.

4. At this stage, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 01.05.2026 before the Court, which is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place in the file.

5. As per the custody certificate, appellant is also involved in another case, i.e., FIR No. 36 dated 26.01.2024, registered under Sections 307, 324, 506, 34 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak. In the said case, appellant has already been convicted by the trial Court, vide judgment dated 09.01.2026.

6. Considering the criminal antecedents of the appellant and the likelihood of his associating with other criminals, plea for bail made by the appellant was dismissed by the Court below, vide order dated 15.04.2026, observing as under:—

***“18.** It is well considering the facts that gravity of offence is not a relevant consideration for declining the bail to the juvenile, however, when the facts revealed that the present CCL 'A' had come together with other CCLs armed with weapons and gave knife*



blows to the deceased. The age of the CCL 'A' is about 16 years 09 days on the date of incident and it cannot go without believe that if released he may associate with other criminals or effect the victim of this case as one case under. Section 307 IPC was registered against him and he was convicted in that case.

The CCL A' again repeating another incident in the form when the present FIR got registered is alarming in nature and this incident also allegedly taking place with the participation of the present CCL 'A' with two more CCLs who are all jointly facing trial today before the Children's Court, for this reason, his association in criminal activity in future if released on bail, cannot be overruled, for which reason, he does not qualify to be granted bail.”

7. Moreover, Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, says as under:-

“12. Bail to a person who is apparently a child alleged to be in conflict with law.—

(1) When any person, who is apparently a child and is alleged to have committed a bailable or non-bailable offence, is apprehended or detained by the police or appears or brought before a Board, such person shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or in any other law for the time being in force, be released on bail with or without surety or placed under the supervision of a probation officer or under the care of any fit person:

Provided that such person shall not be so released if there appears reasonable grounds for believing that the release is likely to bring that person into association with any known criminal or expose the said person to moral, physical or psychological danger or the person's release would defeat the ends of justice, and the Board shall record the reasons for



denying the bail and circumstances that led to such a decision.

(2) When such person having been apprehended is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the officer-in-charge of the police station, such officer shall cause the person to be kept only in an observation home [or a place of safety, as the case may be] in such manner as may be prescribed until the person can be brought before a Board.

(3) When such person is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the Board, it shall make an order sending him to an observation home or a place of safety, as the case may be, for such period during the pendency of the inquiry regarding the person, as may be specified in the order.

(4) When a child in conflict with law is unable to fulfil the conditions of bail order within seven days of the bail order, such child shall be produced before the Board for modification of the conditions of bail.”

8. In view of the antecedents of the appellant and the observations recorded by the Children’s Court, this Court does not find any illegality or infirmity in the order dated 15.04.2026 (impugned herein). **Consequently, present appeal stands dismissed.**

05.05.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No