



CRM-M-863-2025

-1-

254

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-863-2025

Date of Decision:- 16.07.2025

Ravinder @ Ravi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI


Present:- Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.(Oral)


1. Petitioner – Ravinder @ Ravi has filed second petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 107 dated 14.05.2023, under Section 6 of POCSO Act, 2012, Section 67 of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 376(2)(n), 506 of IPC 1860 (Report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented for offences under Section 6 of POCSO Act 2012, Section 66-C of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 376(2)(n), 376(2)(f), 376(3), 376-C and 506 of IPC 1860), registered at Police Station PGIMS, Rohtak.

2. As per facts of case, prosecutrix gave her statement that she was residing as tenant in the house of Sh. Narender Rathi, Chunnipuri,



Rohtak. Her parents were residing in the village of her grandmother at Karewadi, Sonipat, Police Station Gohana since 2010. She also stayed in the said village along with her parents from 2010 till 2017. When she was 14 years of age, studying in 9th class nephew of her grandmother namely Ravinder @ Ravi who was studying in 12th class seduced her and established physical relations with her against her wishes by going on the roof of his house. He threatened to eliminate her in case she disclosed this fact to anyone. He continued to have physical relations with her. In the year 2017 when she was in 12th class, he continued to establish physical relations with her and also clicked her objectionable photographs. Thereafter, she started doing BA.LLB Ist year in MDU Rohtak. In the year 2017-18, Ravinder @ Ravi again approached her and took her to a deserted place in the campus of Maharishi Dayanand University and again physically exploited her against her wishes. When she stopped meeting him, he started giving threats on phone. He was also having illegal weapon. He forced her to marry him. He also threatened to upload her objectionable photographs on social media. Finally, the matter was reported to the police.


3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that petitioner was arrested in this case on 13.07.2023. Allegations levelled against him are false. Challan was presented on 22.09.2023. Statement of prosecutrix has been recorded as PW-11 (Annexure P-2). Without considering the factual position, his bail application was declined by learned Judge Special Court, Rohtak vide order dated 09.07.2024 (Annexure P-3). He had approached this Court by filing regular bail petition bearing CRM-M-36166-2024



which came up for hearing and the same was withdrawn on 02.08.2024. The complainant is now practicing as an advocate. She also visited District Jail Rohtak to meet the petitioner. The information received through RTI in this regard is Annexure P-4. Petitioner is involved in another FIR No.41 dated 25.01.2017, under Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Rai, Sonipat. He has never been declared proclaimed offender. He is ready to abide by the terms and conditions of bail order. Therefore, his regular bail application may be allowed.

4. Detailed Status report has been filed by learned counsel representing State confirming the allegations against the petitioner. The statement of victim was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. which is Annexure R-1. She had supported her version. Challan is presented in this case on 28.09.2023 and the charges were framed on 16.07.2024. It is pointed out that out of 23 witnesses, 16 witnesses have already been examined. As per para No.7 of Status report, petitioner was involved in four other FIRs i.e. FIR No.125 dated 28.09.2014, under Section 323, 324, 341 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mohana, District Sonapat, FIR No.62 dated 10.05.2015, under Section 307, 34 of IPC and 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Chandani Bagh, District Panipat, FIR No.41 dated 25.01.2017, under Section 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Rai, District Sonipat and FIR No.325 dated 13.07.2017, under Sections 285, 287 of IPC, registered at Police Station City, Gohana. Considering the gravity of offence and his conduct, petitioner is not entitled to be released on regular bail.

5. I have considered the aforesaid factual position. As per the



contents of the FIR, prosecutrix was sexually exploited by the petitioner when she was 14 years of age till filing of the aforesaid FIR. She has narrated various incidents when she was sexually exploited. She further claimed that she was under constant threat from the petitioner who was also having illegal weapon. The victim as PW-11 supported her version. Copy of her statement is Annexure P-2. As per the status report, petitioner is involved in other FIRs of serious nature including for the offence under Arms Act. Therefore, considering the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find merits in the regular bail petition filed by petitioner and the same is accordingly declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

16.07.2025

Sunil devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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