



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-67951-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 12.02.2026

Manpreet Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Bhupinder Kaur Bhangu, Advocate for
Mr. Angrej Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Manpreet Singh	15	24.02.2025	3, 4 & 6 of POCSO Act, 2012	Dhilwan	Kapurthala

2. As per allegations in the FIR, (i) Ramandeep Singh @ Raman, (ii) Pawandeep Singh @ Pawan, and (iii) Manpreet Singh (petitioner herein), have sexually abused the child of the age of about 12 years on 21.02.2025. FIR was got registered by Manpreet Kaur, who is related as mother of the victim child. As per the allegations in FIR, when the complainant reached to the victim child, then the victim child told her that aforesaid accused have sexually abused him one after the other. Same was the statement of the



victim child on 27.03.2025, when his statement was recorded before the Ld. Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kapurthala.

However, during the Medico Legal Examination on 26.02.2025 in the column of ‘General Condition’, no injury on any part of the anal area was noticed. The description mentioned in the MLR reads as under:-

General Condition	<i>Patient is calm, conscious, co-operative and well oriented to time, place and person. Vitals are within normal limits.</i> <i>On local examination</i> <i>1) No externally visible fresh injury seen over gluteal region at time of examination.</i> <i>2) No perianal externally visible injury seen at time of examination. Anal sphincter is normal at time of examination. Anal reflex is normal. Gait is normal. No blood/foreign material present. No perianal laceration present.</i> <i>3) History of bath after alleged h/o sexual assault</i> <i>4) History of changing of clothes present. Alleged clothes worn at the time of incident by the patient are sealed and are handed over to the police personnel.</i> <i>5) Advise – Surgeon opinion for protoscopic examination from Civil Hospital Kapurthala is advised.</i> <i>6) Following samples are taken</i> <i>1) blood sample</i> <i>2) high anal swab sample</i> <i>3) low anal swab sample</i> <i>4) perianal swab sample</i>
-------------------	---

3. Petitioner is inside jail for a period of more than 11 months. During the course of trial, complainant Manpreet Kaur (mother of the victim child) appeared in the witness box and did not support the prosecution version. Similarly, Jasbir Singh, brother-in-law of the complainant, who had accompanied her in searching for the child, has also been examined and has not supported the case of the prosecution. The victim child, who was examined as PW-3, has also not corroborated the allegations levelled in the FIR and thus, has failed to support the prosecution story on material aspects.



4. Learned counsel further submits that the co-accused, namely, Ramandeep Singh @ Raman and Pawandeep Singh @ Pawan, have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, vide common order dated 18.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-34522-2025 & connected case, titled as, “*Ramandeep Singh @ Raman v. State of Punjab*” (Annexure P-3).

Thus, in view of the above factual position, and on the ground of parity, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that petitioner be also extended the concession of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel while vehemently opposing the prayer for grant of bail, submits that allegations in the FIR are grave in nature and pertains to an offence under the POCSO Act, involving a child of tender age. Further submits that merely because some of the witnesses have resiled from their previous statements, petitioner cannot automatically claim bail at this stage, as the prosecution is yet to examine the remaining material witnesses, including the medical experts.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute that petitioner is in custody for more than 11 months, and that the complainant – Manpreet Kaur (mother of the victim child), Jasbir Singh (brother-in-law of the complainant), and the victim child himself, have been examined before the trial Court and they have not supported the prosecution version.

6. Heard.

7. From the deposition of the material witnesses already examined, it is noticeable that:

- (i) The complainant (mother of the victim) and Jasbir Singh have not supported the prosecution’s case in their on-oath



statements;

- (ii) The victim child, examined as PW-3, has also not supported the allegations recorded in the FIR or in his statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C.; and
- (iii) Petitioner has undergone custody period for more than 11 months, and the trial is likely to take considerable time, as several prosecution witnesses are still to be examined.

At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose, particularly in view of the testimony of the material witnesses already on record.

8. Accordingly, in the given facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on



record.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 12, 2026
J.Ram

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