



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M No.38827 of 2026
Date of decision: 07.08.2026

HARDIK BHATIA
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
.... Petitioner
.... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI

Present : Mr. Aditya Sanghi and Mr. Pradeep Bhardwaj, Advocates
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAMESH KUMARI, J. (oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS (erstwhile Section 439 of Cr.P.C.) by the petitioner for grant of regular bail as the petitioner has been implicated in criminal case arising out of First Information Report as detailed hereinunder:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
113	23.03.2026	351(2), 3(5) of BNS (erstwhile Sections 506 and 34 of IPC) and Section 12 of POCSO Act	Faridabad Kotwali, District Faridabad

2. Status report dated 06.08.2026 as well as custody certificate dated 05.08.2026 filed on behalf of the respondent-State are taken on record. Copy thereof, has been supplied to counsel opposite



CRM-M No.38827 of 2026

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as complainant are *ad idem* that the statement of victim has been recorded but she has not been cross examined till date and in fact, application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. (corresponding to 358 BNSS) moved by the prosecution has already been allowed and co-accused Yankit Sharma has also been summoned to face trial along with the present petitioner.
4. The allegations against the present petitioner as per the FIR and the statement of the victim is that he pressurized the victim to be friendly with him and exhorted the petitioner to send her nude photographs and she shared nude photographs on the instagram ID of the petitioner.
5. The mobile phone of the petitioner and victim had already been taken into possession and sent to FSL and report has yet not been received. The petitioner cannot control the outcome of the FSL report. Therefore, without commenting on the merits of the case and specially keeping in view the age of the petitioner i.e. 20 years, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the concession of interim pre-arrest bail.
6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed, and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, subject to the following conditions:-
 - (i) *The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court and shall deposit the passport in the trial Court.*
 - (ii) *The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.*



CRM-M No.38827 of 2026

-3-

- (iii) *The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.*
- (iv) *) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.*
- (v) *The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.*
- (vi) *The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.*
- (vii) *The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.*
- (viii) *The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.*
- (ix) *(ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.*

7. It is made clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

8. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed

CRM-M No.38827 of 2026

-4-

as an opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

07.08.2026
Jyoti - 70

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

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