



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

207

**CRM-M-33822-2026
Date of decision: 19.06.2026**

GURPREET SINGH @ KIRAT

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Ms. Taanvi Dhull, Advocate for
Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 142 dated 20.07.2025, registered under Section(s) 64 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 6 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 at Police Station Sadar Jagraon, Ludhiana.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Kamaljeet Kaur (mother of the victim) widow of Ram Krishan Singh dated 20.07.2025 wherein she alleged that her youngest daughter aged nearly 17 years had gone missing on the intervening night of 19.07.2025. She came back

the same night and informed her that the petitioner herein threatened her and had taken away her to a secluded place in the fields and had made forcible physical relations with her against her wishes. It was on the aforesaid statement that the present FIR had been registered. Counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody since 20.07.2025 and that 07 prosecution witnesses have been examined while 07 witnesses still remain to be examined. She further contends that the complainant Kamaljeet Kaur i.e. mother of the victim herself as well as the other witness i.e. Ranjit Singh-uncle of the victim have resiled from their earlier statements and turned hostile and had not supported the case of the prosecution. She contends that there is no other evidence/recovery effected from the petitioner which would connect him to the commission of the alleged offence save and except the solitary, self-serving statement of the victim herself. It is submitted that in the absence of corroboration from the prosecutrix and in view of the material witnesses having failed to support the prosecution's case, further custodial detention of the petitioner would be unwarranted.

3. Counsel for the respondent-State contends that at the time of the alleged incident the victim was minor. He, however, is not in a situation to dispute that the victim as well as material witnesses including the complainant and uncle of the victim have not supported the case of the prosecution.

4. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

5. Be that as it may, without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, the conduct of the

prosecution witnesses and their testimony in the Court as well as the period of custody already undergone alongwith the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

JUNE 19, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No