



**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026**

-1-

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

217

**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026
Date of decision: 06.07.2026**

Ankit Bedi @ Boxer

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present :- Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-25147-2026

For the averments made in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Delay of 152 days in filing the revision petition is condoned.

CRM-25148-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

Copy of FIR, order dated 04.08.2025, grounds of appeal and impugned order dated 04.10.2025 are taken on record.

Main Case

1. Challenge in the present petition is to the order dated 04.10.2025 passed by Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Kaithal, whereby appeal preferred by the petitioner against order dated 04.08.2025 passed by Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Kaithal,



**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026**

-2-

declining him the concession of bail, has been dismissed, in case arising out of FIR No.80, dated 06.04.2025, registered under Sections 109, 3(5), 60 of BNS, 2023, Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Explosive Act, 1884 and Sections 13, 16, 18 & 23 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (Amendment 2012), at Police Station Guhla, District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was pursuing ITI course at the time. On 06.04.2025 at about 5.20 am, an explosion took place behind the building situated within the boundary wall of the police post/naka. Subsequently, a social media post seemingly issued by the Babbar Khalsa Terrorist Organization claimed responsibility for the said blast. Upon inquiry, it was found that the incident was a grenade attack on the police personnel deployed at Naka. Consequently, the aforesaid FIR was registered. It is submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 18.04.2025 when he was aged about 17 years 10 months. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner thereafter moved an application before the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Kaithal, for grant of bail. The said application was, however, dismissed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Kaithal while observing that even though the gravity of the allegations was yet to be established, however, the Social Investigation Report of the petitioner reflected that the financial condition of the petitioner's family was poor and they belonged to the Below Poverty Line category. It was further reflected in the report that the petitioner had been excessively using mobile phone and social media and was under the influence of his peer group. It was also reported that, if released on bail, there existed an apprehension of the petitioner being drawn into similar



**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026**

-3-

activity and commit such a crime again as it has come out during investigation that his father has links with Khalistan Jindabad Force, an organization operated by Shahzad Bhatti and Zeeshan Akhtar, who are also accused in the murder of Baba Siddique.

3. Referring to above, it was recorded by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Kaithal, that the petitioner is required to be kept in custody for his own benefit and in order to avoid his chances of being exposed to other criminal minded persons as well as physical, physiological and immoral danger.

4. Aggrieved thereof, the petitioner preferred CRA/232/2025 before the Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Kaithal. Vide order dated 04.10.2025, the said appeal was also dismissed. It was noticed that father of the appellant (petitioner herein) had already expired, and that he was under strong influence of social media and it was necessary to keep him away from social media for his own benefit as any such exposure coupled with lack of parental care, is likely to induce the petitioner in further unlawful activities.

5. Learned counsel contends that the reasons assigned by both the Courts are contrary to the mandate and object of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (for short 'the Act'). It is submitted that the grounds cited by the Juvenile Justice Board, Kaithal as well as Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Kaithal, are based on mere presumptions and the apprehensions and are not supported by any cogent material on record. Counsel submits that the social investigation report



**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026**

-4-

merely highlights that the petitioner was excessively using mobile phone and social media and was under the influence of his peer group. It is, however, contended that such observations, by itself, are not sufficient to conclude that the petitioner had any nexus with the Khalistan Zindabad Force or was associated in any unlawful activities. Counsel contends that the report does not indicate that, if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to be exposed to any physical, psychological and immoral danger or that his release would defeat the ends of justice. It is further contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and that his continued incarceration, in the absence of any tangible or cogent material attracting the exceptions under the Act, would defeat the protection intended to be extended to the child-in-conflict with law under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. He further submits that even though the prosecution evidence is at an advanced stage, however, notwithstanding the same, in the absence of any incriminating material having been brought on record to establish the petitioner's involvement in the occurrence or commission of any other offence or his association with any criminal or unlawful organization, concession of bail ought to be extended to him.

6. Learned State counsel submits that trial is at the advanced stage and the prosecution evidence already stands concluded. Thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed at this stage.

7. She, however, does not dispute that the social investigation report only mentions about the Net-addiction of the petitioner, his exposure to social media and his susceptibility to peer group influence. She is



**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026**

-5-

however, currently not in a position to refer to any incriminating objective material on the basis whereof petitioner's association with any criminal or any unlawful organization may be established or assumed. She is also not in a position to verify as to whether any other elder member of the family or parent is available to supervise the petitioner. Mere demise of one of the parent, by itself, would not lead to a presumption that the petitioner is devoid of any parental control.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the mandate of Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 as well as the absence of statutory grounds warranting denial of bail, coupled with the fact that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is in custody for 01 year, 02 months and 12 days, we are of the view that ordinarily a child-in-conflict with law is to be released on bail, unless the Court is satisfied that any of the exceptions under Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, as would disentitle the child-in-conflict to the grant of bail exist. The reasons assigned by the Juvenile Justice Board as well as Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Kaithal, in our considered opinion do not conform to the statutory parameters prescribed under Section 12 of the Act.

9. Hence, the instant revision petition is allowed and impugned order dated 04.10.2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Kaithal as well as the order dated 04.08.2025 passed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Kaithal are set aside. The petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his/her furnishing bail/surety



**CRM-25147-2026 and
CRM-25148-2026 in/and
CRR-1519-2026**

-6-

bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate.

10. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

12. Pending application(s), if any, shall also dispose of.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

06.07.2026
monika

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE**

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