

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

2026:PHHC:007751



(216)

CRM-M-60062-2025

Date of Decision: 20.01.2026

Ian Reggie

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)

1. The instant first petition is for seeking concession of regular bail under Section 483, BNSS, 2023 in case bearing FIR No.217 dated 03.07.2025 under Sections 318(4), 61 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 4(4), 5(2), 6(c), 23 of the Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 1994, registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt., District Ambala.

2. The present FIR has been registered on the complaint of Nodal Officer, P.N.D.T, Ambala, which reads as under:-

“Dr. Vipin Bhandari, Nodal Officer, PNDT Ambala, regarding lodging an FIR under Section 4(4), 5(2), 6(c) and punishable under section 23 of PC- PNDT Act and Section 318(4), 61(2) BNS against petitioner IAN Reggie S/o Sh. C. D Mathews and Sagar Polous S/o Mr. Roshan Polous. It is submitted that on 03.07.2025, an information was received by Civil Surgeon, Ambala from the PNDT Raiding team District Kurukshetra regarding involvement of touts based of District Ambala in eliciting illegal activities of Pre-Natal Fetal

Sex Determination. In response to this, District Appropriate, Authority, Ambala constituted a team of Officers vide office Order No. PNDT/2025/531 dated 03.07.2025 to join the proceedings under PC-PNDT Act along with PNDT Raiding Team Kurukshetra. It was submitted that PNDT Team Ambala contacted PNDT Team Kurukshetra and reached Civil Hospital, Ambala Cantt as asked by PNDT raiding team Kurukshetra. After reaching at Civil Hospital, Ambala Cantt, PNDT Team Ambala joined the Kurukshetra team who were already waiting at Civil Hospital, Ambala Cantt. A joint operation was done by both the teams as per the details in spot memo and nabbed two touts indulged in eliciting illegal activities under above said law and provisions.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations against the petitioner, he was sitting outside the Ultrasound Room of Civil Hospital, Ambala Cantt. when the raid was conducted and as per the statement made by patient namely Manju Devi on 03.07.2025, the co-accused Sagar Polous, who was the staff member, was the one who got the ultrasound conducted from the concerned doctor/Radiologist. The patient was made to wait outside the room in the meanwhile. The co-accused namely Sagar Polous came outside with the ultrasound of the patient and found the gender of the foetus. Counsel further contends that the petitioner is neither a practising doctor nor a staff member of the raided hospital. Besides, he is not found to have been involved in any process of conducting a Pre-Natal Diagnostic procedure for gender determination or communicating with the patient qua the gender of the foetus. He contends that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner. He further contends that Sagar Polous, against whom allegations have been made to have undertaken the gender determination test, has already been granted the concession of regular bail. He further submits that petitioner is in

custody since 03.07.2025 and charges have not yet been framed, even though, investigation is complete and final report has been filed. There are 15 witnesses to be examined and conclusion of trial, thus, shall take long. He further submits that petitioner is not involved in any other case and is a man of clean antecedents.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed herein above and taking into consideration the attribution against the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the period of custody already undergone as well as the bail already having been granted to the co-accused namely Sagar Polous, I deem it appropriate to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

20.01.2026

lucky

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