



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

**CRM-M-24917-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:13.05.2025**

Prince Chot @ Saabi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present:- Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. H.P.S. Ishar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bedi, Advocate General, Punjab, assisted with  
Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0108 dated 29.12.2024 under Sections 137(2) and 96 of BNS, registered at Police Station Pojewal, SBS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for about 04 months and 12 days and the investigation in the present case has been completed. He further submitted that charges have already been framed, but not even a single witness has been examined till date. As per the allegations contained in the FIR, the prosecutrix/victim, who is the daughter of the complainant and was 16½ years old at the time of the incident, was allegedly taken and enticed away by the petitioner on the pretext of marriage. He submitted



that it is not a case which falls within the purview of Section 96 of the BNS and therefore, the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel submitted that, insofar as the custody of the petitioner is concerned, the same is correct and it is also correct that charges have been framed in the present case under Sections 137(2) and 96 of the BNS. He further submitted that the argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that the provision of Section 96 of the BNS is not attracted is misconceived because it is a case where the allegations against the petitioner are that he enticed away and kidnapped the daughter of the complainant with the intention of establishing a physical relationship with her. He submitted that prosecutrix has not been examined till date and there is a reasonable apprehension that, if the petitioner is released on bail, he may not only abscond or flee from justice but may also influence the witnesses, including the prosecutrix and therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

5. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for about 04 months and 12 days. It is a case where allegations against the petitioner are with regard to enticing away the minor daughter of the complainant on the pretext of marriage who was 16½ years old at the time of incident. The prosecutrix has not been examined till date as per the learned counsels for the parties. Charges under Sections 137(2) and 96 of the BNS have already been framed in the present case. The argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that the provision of Section 96 of the BNS cannot be invoked is misconceived, in view of the applicability of the said provision.



Even otherwise, charges have already been framed under Section 96 of the BNS and therefore, the petitioner cannot be considered for grant of regular bail on this ground. The apprehension raised by learned State counsel that in case the petitioner is released on bail, he may not only abscond but also influence material witnesses, carries weight and cannot be ignored and as such in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court does not deem it fit and proper to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. 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.

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)**  
**JUDGE**

**13.05.2025**

*shweta*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No