



CRM-M-62722-2025 (O&M)

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

208

CRM-M-62722-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.02.2026

**JARMAN SINGH ALIAS JAMMU
ALIAS JARMANJIT SINGH**

PETITIONER**VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER****RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Present: Mr. Nitin Narula, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akash Yadav, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No. 57 dated 21.03.2024 under Sections 363, 366 IPC. Sections 366-A, 376, 109 IPC, Section 6 and 17 of The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012 have been added and Section 366 IPC has been deleted from the FIR, Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural. This is the second petition for regular bail, the first one was dismissed as withdrawn.

2. Case was registered on complaint of father of the prosecutrix, who reported that his minor daughter, date of birth 08.08.2008 had been taken away by Jarman Singh alias Jammu on the pretext of marriage on 19.03.2024 when he, his wife and sons went to attend shagun ceremony of their relative.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was behind bars for the last 01 year 10 months; that main witnesses as well as the prosecutrix had been examined during the course of trial. Both did not support



CRM-M-62722-2025 (O&M)

the prosecution case and had exonerated the petitioner. Therefore, petitioner deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail on the ground of serious nature of allegations.

5. Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent No.2 and files his vakalatnama. The same is made part of the record. He has no objection if petitioner is enlarged on regular bail.

6. Statement of the prosecutrix under Section 164 Cr.P.C. is on record. Therein, no allegations of sexual assault were levelled. Statement of the prosecutrix and her father have been recorded during trial. Petitioner is thus in no position to tamper with the evidence. As per statement of learned State counsel, 17 witnesses are yet to be examined. Trial will take some time to conclude. Antecedents of the petitioner are clean. He is not stated to be involved in any other offence. There is no reason to believe that he would obstruct the process of law. In the facts and circumstances of the case, but without commenting on merits, the petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

09.02.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No