



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

CRR-1254-2026

Date of Decision: 21.05.2026

BXXX alias BXXX

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Krishan Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parmod Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition against the impugned order dated 29.04.2026 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Children Court, Kurukshetra, whereby, the appeal filed under Section 101 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') was ordered to be dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not initially named in the FIR nor there was any averment, which even remotely connects him with the commission of crime. He further submits that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by his co-accused and except the said statement, there is no other evidence against him to prove his involvement in the alleged crime. Learned counsel next contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 19.03.2026 and is in custody since then. Apart from that, learned counsel also referred to Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and

Protection of Children) Act, 2015 to contend that the petitioner is entitled to the concession of bail and his case does not fall within the ambit of any of the exceptions mentioned in Section 12 of the Act. Still further, the petitioner is the first offender and his case deserves sympathetic considerations by this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was not initially named as an accused in the present case and was nominated on the strength of the disclosure statement suffered by his co-accused. Apart from that, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than two months and challan has already been presented against him. Moreover, he is juvenile and keeping in view the provisions of Section 12 of the Act, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

6. As a consequence, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

21.05.2026

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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