



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

(130)

CRM-M-67565-2025

Date of Decision: 17.3.2026

Rashid

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 71 dated 10.4.2025 under Sections 3(5), 137(2), 62 BNS and Section 12 of the POCSO Act, registered at Police Station Faridabad N.I.T, Fariabad.

2. The facts in brief are that the complainant got recorded her statement with the police alleging therein that her elder daughter i.e. victim, who was studying in 12th Class, disclosed to her that petitioner Rashid got friendly with her in the year 2021 and he used to have whatsapp chat with her. He started following her in August 2022 when she used to go to her school. On 7th April 2025, she came to know that Rashid came to school along with his friend Shiva and told the school guard that her mother was sick and she should be sent along with them. When the guard asked about the name of her mother, Shiva could not tell and thereafter they went back. The complainant alleged that Rashid and Shiva wanted to kidnap her daughter.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner aged 18 years, has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant, who is the mother of the prosecutrix. It is submitted that as per the footage of the CCTV, the petitioner was not present at the place of the alleged occurrence. Moreover, no complaint with regard to the alleged incident was made by the guard of the school or the school authorities to the police. Furthermore, there is a delay of 3½ days in registration of the present FIR. It is also submitted that vide order dated 01.8.2025 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-29294-2025, the similarly placed co-accused Vikas has been granted the concession of regular bail. He further submits that the victim already stands examined, however, she has not supported the case of the prosecution. The petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 11 months and 06 days and there is no other criminal case registered against him.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. He 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 11 months and 06 days. The learned State counsel, on instructions from the investigating officer concerned, submits that in the present case, charges were framed on 08.9.2025 and out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, 03 have been examined till date. He submits that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

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



6. Trite to say that at the stage of considering a petition seeking bail, the Court, though not required to make a roving inquiry into the evidence, must take into consideration the nature of the offence, severity of the punishment and *prima facie*, the involvement of the accused and the material on record.

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 08.9.2025. Yet, only 03 out of 14 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 11 months and 06 days. It is also not disputed that he has no criminal antecedents and is not involved in any other case. The similarly situated co-accused Vikas has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 01.8.2025.

9. While the truthfulness or otherwise of the allegations levelled against him 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

***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.



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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

March 17th, 2026
Gurpreet Singh

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