



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

(211)

**CRM-M-54895-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.09.2025**

RANJEET

.....Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Lakhinder Singh Lakhanpal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.16 dated 18.03.2024, under Section 506 of IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Women Police Station NIT, Faridabad, District Faridabad (challan filed under Sections 506, 34 of IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act).

2. The translated version of the FIR is reproduced below:-

“Police Station Women, NIT Faridabad statement of xxxx daughter of Rakesh Kumar resident of Village Jakha, PO Karsana, District Kasganj UP at present resident of village Sarurpur Faridabad landlord Lokesh son of Sh.Rajbir, resident of Near Jat Dharmshal and aged about 17 years Mobile



No.82796xxxxx, 75059xxxxx. Stated that I am resident of above noted address and I am illiterate. We are six sibling. I am at number 4. My parents used to do labour work. On February 2024, Ranjeet who lives in upper floor of our house on rent, committed forcible wrong with me. Took me forcible in his room and in the month of February, 2024 Ranjeet committed wrong with me thrice without my consent. Due to fear I did not disclosed to my mother due to fear because he had given threat to kill me. Legal action be taken against Ranjeet. I have got recorded my statement, heard which is true. I have recorded my statement in the presence of my mother namely xxxx without any pressure, fear and greed. Sd/- xxxx”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case on the statement of 17 year old prosecutrix, made under family pressure, alleging therein that the petitioner had committed wrong acts with her thrice without her consent. It is submitted that the petitioner and the prosecutrix were well known to each other. Further, there is also unexplained delay of about a month in the registration of the instant FIR. The petitioner, a young man aged 20 years, has already undergone actual custody of 1 year, 5 months and 14 days and has clean antecedents.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer of the petitioner and submits that there are specific serious allegations against the present petitioner of committing aggravated penetrative sexual assault upon the prosecutrix. Upon her medical examination, the prosecutrix was found to be 13 weeks' pregnant, for which she had to later undergo the process of termination of the pregnancy. A perusal of the status report reveals that the prosecutrix was minor at the time of alleged occurrence, her date of birth



being 10.05.2007 as per the school records. Furthermore, in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. as also her statement made before the Child Welfare Committee, serious and specific allegations were levelled by the prosecutrix against the petitioner. During the course of investigation, the medical examination of the petitioner was also got conducted on 23.03.2024, upon which it was opined by the Medical Officer that there is nothing to suggest that the petitioner was unable to perform sexual intercourse. Thereupon, the samples of the prosecutrix and the petitioner were sent for forensic analysis, the report of which is awaited. It was under these circumstances that challan was presented and thereafter charges were framed against the petitioner. There are total 27 prosecution witnesses, out of which only two have been examined including the prosecutrix, who has supported the case of the prosecution.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
6. *Prima facie*, serious and specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner in the FIR, which were reiterated by the prosecutrix, in her statements made before the Child Welfare Committee and under Section 164 Cr.P.C., as also in her testimony as a prosecution witness. As per the date of birth mentioned in the school records, the prosecutrix was a minor at the time of alleged offence, and upon her medical examination was found to be 13 weeks' pregnant. Therefore, in view of the same, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.
7. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed. However, considering the prolonged custody undergone by the petitioner, the learned trial Court is encouraged to conclude the trial expeditiously.



8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

September 08, 2025
Ithlesh

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