

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

2026:PHHC:080036



CRM-M-28979 of 2026(O&M)

Date of Order:21.05.2026

Randhir Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Sama, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aakash Yadav, AAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No. 38 dated 19.06.2023, under Sections 376, 120-B IPC 1860 and Section 4 of POCSO Act, 2012, Police Station Khuhi Khera, District Fazilka. This is the first application for anticipatory bail.

2. The case was registered on complaint of minor prosecutrix 'KK' aged 17 years who stated that she was a student of Class 12 in Government School and Randhir Singh son of Ramesh Singh, classmate of her elder brother Gurjit Singh, was on visiting terms in their home. The week before, she had gone to the house of her maternal grand-mother in Jandwala Mira Sangla in June holidays, where, on 17.06.2023, she received a call from Randhir Singh. She came out of the house at 10:30 p.m. after taking his call. There was a car parked outside. When she went near the car, Randhir Singh forcibly pulled her to the back seat of the car. Parveen Singh son of Piara Singh was already present in the Car. He drove the car and stopped on a dirt road near village Patrewala. Parveen Singh went out of the

car and Randhir Singh forcibly raped her on the back seat, despite protest. Later, at about 11:00 p.m. he dropped her outside her home. She disclosed the incident to her aunt Bimala Rani. The next day, her parents took her to village Bakainwala and then to Civil Hospital Fazilka, where she was medico legally examined.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the story of the prosecutrix as narrated in the FIR was not reliable and it was doubtful that petitioner violated her in the manner alleged. It was apparent from the FIR that prosecutrix intentionally went with some person of her free will and later, levelled false allegations against the petitioner and his friend. He further submits that the prosecutrix had sworn affidavit Annexure P-2 that she could not recognize the person who committed rape as his face was muffled and out of misunderstanding she mentioned the name of Randhir Singh (petitioner). He submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation and may be allowed anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail submitting that the petitioner was classmate of the victim's elder brother, on visiting terms in her house and there was no question of any misunderstanding. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required for effective investigation and petitioner did not deserve the concession of bail in view of nature of allegations.

5. Petitioner is alleged to have committed penetrative sexual assault on minor prosecutrix aged 17 years. Allegations against him are direct and specific. It appears from affidavit of prosecutrix Annexure P-2 that petitioner is already making attempts to influence the victim and

tamper with evidence. There are no extraordinary grounds to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

21.05.2026

reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No