



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

222

CRM-M-12586-2025
Date of decision : 29.04.2025

Jagandeep Singh @ JagoPetitioner

versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for the complainant.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.185 dated 12.10.2021 registered under Sections 363 & 366-A of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar, District Tarn Taran.

2. The abovesaid FIR was registered on a statement made by complainant-Balwinder Kaur stating therein that on 10.10.2021, after having dinner, she along with her family went for sleep and when she woke up at 6:00 A.M., she saw that her daughter (whose date of birth is 21.03.2004) was not present on the bed. She tried to search her at her own level but could not find her. She has full confidence that her daughter had been enticed away by Jagandeep Singh @ Jago (the petitioner) by alluring marriage with her. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 05.01.2025 and the daughter of the complainant was got recovered.

**CRM-M-12586-2025****2**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The marriage between the petitioner and the daughter of the complainant was solemnized on 16.07.2023 and out of the said wedlock one child was born on 27.07.2024. The victim in her statement dated 09.01.2025 recorded under Section 183 of BNSS has categorically stated that in the midnight on 10.10.2021, she had dispute with her mother-Balwinder Kaur and her mother had slapped her and then she became angry and went to Harmandir Sahib, Amritsar, where she lived for four days and when she calm down, she returned back to her house. Thereafter, she performed marriage with the petitioner on 16.07.2023 and she is happily residing at her matrimonial home. On 05.01.2025, when the police apprehended her husband then they came to know that one FIR has been registered against her husband. He further submits that the complainant (mother of the victim) and her father have not supported the case of the prosecution in their statements recorded before the Trial Court. The petitioner is in custody since 05.01.2025 and he is not involved in any other case. He further submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan has been presented; charges have been framed and out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far. He further submits that the trial may take a considerable time to conclude, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind bars.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the abovesaid assertions made by learned

**CRM-M-12586-2025****3**

counsel for the petitioner. She has filed custody certificate in the Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months and he is not involved in any other case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS; the fact that the complainant (mother of the victim) and her father have not supported the case of the prosecution, custody of the petitioner, which is more than 03 months and the facts that investigation is complete; challan has been presented; charges have been framed; out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far; the petitioner is not involved in any other case and the trial may take a considerable time to conclude, therefore, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

7. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

8. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

29.04.2025*kothiyal***(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No