



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

(113)

CRM-M-64315-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.05.2026

SAHIL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS.

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Harkaran Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Guramrit Kaur, DAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Mr. Shahzad Singh Jeji, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and files his power of attorney, which is taken on record

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.45 dated 09.06.2025 under Section 64 of BNS and Section 6 of POCSO Act, registered at Police Station City Kurali, District SAS Nagar.

3. Brief factual matrix of the case is that a ruka was received on 27.05.2025 regarding the admission of a seemingly minor girl in the hospital, who was found to be three months' pregnant. However, a statement was made by the mother of the girl before the concerned officials of the investigating agency that her daughter was 19 years of age, and thereafter she refused legal action against anyone. Thereafter, a letter dated 05.06.2025

was received at the concerned police station from the Child Welfare



Committee, Sector-76, Mohali, about the same victim, who they stated to be as 14 years of age. Accordingly, the instant FIR was registered on 09.06.2025, and after following due process, the petitioner was arrested.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is the foremost submission that there is no conclusive evidence on record to establish the age of the prosecutrix. Be that as it may, the allegations levelled against the petitioner, that he established forceful relations with the prosecutrix, as a result of which she became pregnant, are without any basis. In fact, as per the own admission of the prosecutrix, she had got aborted her fetus, which was then disposed of by her in a water body. It is the further submission, that even the statements made by the prosecutrix and her mother suffer from material contradictions. Even otherwise, they have been duly examined before the learned trial Court. He submits that the petitioner, now aged about 22 years, has already undergone an actual custody of 10 months and 20 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 10 months and 20 days. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court. The charges were framed on 18.07.2025 and out of a total of 25 prosecution witnesses, 10 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 18.07.2025. Yet, only 10 out of 25 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 10 months and 20 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

May 05, 2026
Ithlesh

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