2026:PHHC:086163

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

102 **CRM-M-31470-2026 (O&M)**
Date of decision: 29.05.2026

Rasandeep Singh @ Seepa **…Petitioner**

V/S

State of Punjab

…Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Balraj Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

****

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.(ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.100 dated 30.04.2026, under Sections 3, 4 and 5 of Immoral Tragic (Prevension) Act, 1956, Police Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner had been falsely implicated in the case. As per case set up, some young men and women who were apprehended from a house disclosed that the petitioner was running the business of prostitution. Petitioner was not present at the spot and there was no rent deed available on record to show that he had taken the house on rent from its owner. The disclosure statement of co-accused was not admissible. Petitioner had clean antecedents and was ready and willing to join investigation.

KAPIL
2026.05.29 20:06
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, arguing that on 26.04.2026, the police party, while on patrol duty chanced upon a house where several boys and girls were present and were found in objectionable position. Name of the petitioner was disclosed as the person who, in connivance with co-accused, Harjinder Singh was running the illegal business of prostitution, forcing the girls in the illegal trade. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required and it was not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Given the nature and substance of allegations against the petitioner who is alleged to be running flesh trade in a premises, his custodial interrogation would be necessitated to elicit useful facts and to recover rent deed of the premises. Grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage, would seriously impede the process of investigation, which is not permissible. Hence the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail is declined.

6. Dismissed.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

29.05.2026
Kapil

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

KAPIL
2026.05.29 20:06
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document