



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(114)

CRM-M-62558-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 22.04.2026

SAHIL @ GOLI

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate and
Mr. Divyansh Som Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Saumya Ahluwalia, Sr. DAG, Haryana

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Despite service, there is no appearance on behalf of respondent No.2.

2. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.48 dated 15.02.2025 under Sections 137, 351(3), 64(2)(m) and 96 of BNS and Section 6 of POCSO Act, registered at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal, District Kaithal.

3. The translated version of the FIR is reproduced below:-

“Contents of complaint are as under:- "To the SHO P.S. Civil Lines. Sector 21, Kaithal. Subject:- For taking action by searching xxxxx daughter of Kuldeep. Sir, I xxxxxx am resident of Balraj Nagar, Gali No.4, Kaithal, Tehsil and District Kaithal. That today on 15.02.2025 at 10:00 am, I went to the shop to buy goods and at that time, she had phone bearing mobile No.93501xxxxxx and my daughter xxxxx has not returned home yet and she is wearing orange coloured suit



and slippers in her feet and has not returned home since 10:00 am. I have also inquired among my relatives but she is not found. I want to find my daughter xxxxx. Hence I request you to search for my daughter xxxxxx and take whatever action is required. It will be your utmost kindness. Thanking you. Sd/- Complainant xxxxx, Mob. No.89309xxxxx.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner was not named in the instant FIR, which was initially lodged as a missing complaint, on the statement of the mother of the prosecutrix. It is submitted that the petitioner and the prosecutrix were in fact well acquainted with each other, the age difference between the two being minimal. In fact, in her statement before the counsellor, the prosecutrix had not attributed any overt act to the petitioner, particularly the allegation of rape. The subsequent adverse statement(s) was only made by her under pressure from the family, which too evidently suffer from material inconsistencies and infirmities. It is the further submission that there is no cogent evidence on record that points towards the complicity of the petitioner. The petitioner, who is aged about 21 years, has already undergone an actual custody of 1 year, 2 months and 2 days. There is no other case registered against him.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. She states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. She has filed custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 1 year, 2 months and 2 days. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court. The charges were framed on 26.02.2025 and out of a total of 22 prosecution witnesses, 7 have been examined. She submits that in view of the serious



allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

6. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. Before proceeding, a gainful reference can be made to the observations passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sanjay Chandra v. CBI, (2012) 1 SCC 40***, relevant paras whereof reads thus:

"21. In bail applications, generally, it has been laid down from the earliest times that the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment, unless it is required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty.

22. From the earliest times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some unconvicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, "necessity" is the operative test. In this country, it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances."

8. Reverting to the case in hand, it is borne out from the record that charges came to be framed on 26.02.2025. Yet, only 7 out of 22 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined. The pace of the proceedings, thus, indicates that the conclusion of trial is not imminent. The petitioner has



already remained in actual custody for a period of 1 year, 2 months and 2 days. It is also not disputed that he has no criminal antecedents and is not involved in any other case.

9. While the truthfulness or otherwise of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the culpability, if any, would be tested and determined on the touchstone of evidence during the course of trial, the parameters governing the grant of bail necessitate a balanced consideration of the nature of accusation, the stage of the trial, the antecedents of the accused, and the likelihood of his absconding or influencing the course of justice.

10. Presently, no material has been placed on record to suggest that the petitioner poses a flight risk or that his release would impede the fair conduct of the trial, particularly when the material witnesses stand examined. Therefore, upon taking into account all the considerations stated hereinbefore, and without expressing an opinion on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the trial, this Court is of the opinion that the continued detention of the petitioner, in the backdrop of the pace of the proceedings and the substantial period of incarceration already undergone, would not advance the cause of justice. The guarantee of personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which includes the right to a speedy trial, obliges the Court to ensure that pre-trial incarceration does not assume a punitive character. The prolonged incarceration, without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future, would also run contrary to the settled legal principle that 'bail is the rule and jail is the exception', as reaffirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another (2018) 3 SCC 22.***



11. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed, and to ensure that the interests of justice are adequately safeguarded, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail upon furnishing of adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, subject to the following terms and conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness(s).
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused of, or for commission of which he is suspected.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

12. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail before this Court.

13. It is reiterated that the observations made in hereinabove are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition, and must not be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

April 22, 2026
Jitlesh

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