



**101+203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-2623-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 27.08.2025

Pronounced on: 28.08.2025

SIDDHARTHA RAVI

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, Sr. DAG Haryana.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Hooda, Advocate
for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

Through this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (previously 438 Cr.P.C.), petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 432 dated 19.12.2024 under Sections 69, 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Sector 13/17, Panipat, Haryana.

As per version in the FIR, prosecutrix alleged that she became acquainted with Siddharth Ravi, aged 33 years, through a social media dating app on 10.09.2023. They exchanged their whatsapp numbers and started talking to each other. On 12.10.2023, on asking of Siddharth, she reached Panipat. He took her to his flat and offered her juice. She lost senses, where after Siddharth Ravi forcibly made physical relations with her. When she regained consciousness, her clothes were removed. When she offered resistance, Siddharth Ravi threatened to defame her. Later on,

**CRM-M-2623-2025 (O&M)****-2-**

he promised to marry her after seeking divorce, if she came to meet him every Saturday and Sunday. He forced her to visit his flat every Saturday and Sunday and she continued doing so, till June 2024. One day, he suddenly told her that he did not want any relationship, stopped taking her calls and blocked her on whatsapp and Instagram. On 04.08.2024, when she reached his flat, he was found in an objectionable position with another girl. When, she made enquiry, she was beaten up. Siddharth Ravi threatened to post her private, obscene photographs and videos on social media and threatened to kill her, if she dared to complain against him. Thereafter, she filed a complaint against him at Police Station 13-17, Panipat. His lawyer came to the Police Station and informed her that Siddharth Ravi would marry her, if she withdrew the complaint. She withdrew the complaint on 02.12.2024. His father assured marriage with Siddharth Ravi, if she agreed to sign a live-in relationship certificate. After withdrawing the complaint, Siddharth Ravi never spoke to her and blocked her. He also conveyed that he could not marry her and that she should choose another boy.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that it was a case of consensual relationship which continued for some time, but failed eventually. He further argued that the prosecutrix was always aware that the petitioner was a married man and could not have performed marriage with her. He submitted that in such a case, there could no promise to marry. While referring to Annexure P-2, learned counsel submitted that the petitioner even executed a live-in relationship agreement affirming



CRM-M-2623-2025 (O&M)

-3-

that they would be free to establish sexual relations on mutual consent, being mature, major adults. It was pointed out that prosecutrix moved a complaint (Annexure P-3) against the petitioner on 29.11.2024, which she withdrew by making statement Annexure P-4. Learned counsel further submitted that in pursuance to interim order of this Court, petitioner had joined investigation. He thus, prayed that petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground that though, petitioner had joined investigation, recovery of his mobile phone was yet to be effected and his further custodial interrogation was necessitated. Status report has been placed on record.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of complainant submitted that the live-in relationship agreement dated 20.09.2023 (Annexure P-2), placed on record by the petitioner, was forged and fabricated and was never signed by the prosecutrix, which fact she had disclosed to the Investigating Agency. He argued that the prosecutrix had been sexually abused for long. Considering the gravity of allegations, petitioner did not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Both the petitioner and prosecutrix are mature adults. Petitioner is a married man. Prosecutrix has not alleged that she was unaware of his marital status. It appears that the relationship was initiated through a social media dating app and prosecutrix had been visiting the flat of the petitioner continuously and physical relations were made.

**CRM-M-2623-2025 (O&M)****-4-**

First complaint dated 29.11.2024 moved by the prosecutrix was withdrawn by her saying that she made the complaint regarding physical relations under misguidance. In these circumstances, whether the offence under Section 376 of IPC is attracted or not, would be moot point to be determined by the trial Court. Pursuant to orders passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined investigation on 03.04.2025. This is so conceded in the status report. Petitioner states that he is ready to deliver his mobile phone to the police. In the given facts and circumstances of the case, anticipatory bail cannot be declined only for the reason that mobile phone has not been recovered.

Without making a comment on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner is allowed to be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. Petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

Pending CRM(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

Reserved on: 27.08.2025

Pronounced on: 28.08.2025

Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No