

CRM-M-24055 of 2026(O&M)

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

2026:PHHC:069882



216

CRM-M-24055 of 2026(O&M)

Reserved on:05.05.2026

Pronounced on:06.05.2026

Uploaded on:06.05.2026

Farid @ Frida

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Vishal Munjal, Advocate and
Ms. Bindu Bala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbee Singh, DAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.0007 dated 22.01.2026 under sections 137(2) of BNS (Section 363 IPC), Section 95 BNS (New Section of BNS, No section in IPC) and Section 96 of BNS (Section 366-A IPC), however, Section 61 of BNS (120-B IPC) vide DDR No. 14 dated 20.3.2026 have been added later on, Police Station Rawalpindi District Kapurthala. This is the first petition for regular bail.

Father of the prosecutrix stated that he had four children, three daughters and a son. On 10.0.1026 at 7:00 p.m. Farida, his wife Malki and their two sons Rafi and Nazir visited them and proposed marriage of his eldest daughter 'J' aged 15 years with Nazir. When he refused, they all forcibly took 'J' on a motor cycle from his house to marry her with Nazir. At

CRM-M-24055 of 2026(O&M)

that time, he was inside the house. He had been searching for his daughter but could find any clue. He suspected that Nazir had lured away his daughter 'J' on the promise of marriage and taken her with his companion.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was behind bars w.e.f. 10.02.2026. He was father of the main accused Nazir with whom daughter of the complainant had eloped. It is urged that the story in the FIR was concocted as there was no occasion for four persons to take away daughter of the complainant on motor cycle. Complainant's daughter had a love affair with Nazir but complainant was not agreeing for her marriage with Nazir on which account, she ran away with him. Petitioner had been implicated on account of his relationship with the main accused, though he had no role in the commission of offence. Co-accused Parmeena @ Venna had been allowed bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, on 17.04.2026. Petitioner had clean antecedents and deserved to be released on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that neither the prosecutrix nor main accused Nazir had been recovered yet. Investigation of the case was still pending and release of the petitioner on bail was not called for.

Truth of the allegations against the petitioner can be determined only on conclusion of trial. There is no reason to believe that he would interfere in the course of justice or flee from the process of law. Petitioner has clean antecedents and his behind bars since 10.02.2026. In the given facts and circumstances of the case but without commenting on merits, petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing

CRM-M-24055 of 2026(O&M)

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

06.05.2026

reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No