



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

**CRM-M-425-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-25.03.2025**

Sonu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Sanjiv Kumar Aggarwal, Advocate and  
Mr. Tejas Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, DAG, Haryana.

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

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.420 dated 02.07.2024 under Sections 346 of IPC (Sections 342 of IPC, 127(2), 351(b), 351(2), 61, 64(1), 64(2) (m) of BNS added and Section 346 of IPC deleted later on), registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat, Haryana.

2. Status report filed on behalf of respondent-State is taken on record. A copy of the same has already been supplied to counsel opposite.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for seven and a half months. He submitted that even as per the prosecution's story, no allegation of rape has been attributed to the petitioner and the only role attributed to the petitioner was that he had allured the victim to get her married to another co-accused,



namely Neeraj. He also referred to the statement under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., wherein the victim has not made any allegation against the petitioner. Additionally, the investigation in the present case has been completed, and the challan has also been presented and therefore the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submitted that, insofar as the custody of the petitioner is concerned, it is correct and it is also correct that investigation in the present case has been completed and although charges have been framed but no prosecution witness has been examined till date.. He submitted that as per the allegations, the role of the petitioner was to allure the victim into getting her married to the other co-accused, namely Neeraj.

5. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that, as per the role attributed to the petitioner by both the learned counsels, the petitioner was only involved in alluring the victim into getting her married to another co-accused, namely Neeraj. The investigation in the present case has already been completed, although no prosecution witnesses have been examined till date. It is also pointed out that in the statement under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., that the complainant has not made any allegations of rape against the petitioner. Furthermore, it is neither the case of the learned State counsel nor it has been argued that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond, flee from justice, influence witnesses, or tamper with evidence. Therefore, this Court is of the view view that, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.



6. Consequently, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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**

**25.03.2025**

*shweta*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No