



CRM-M-6010-2024

-1-

202

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

**CRM-M-6010-2024
Date of Decision: 29.04.2025**

Jaidev

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kodan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate
for the complainant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0609, dated 18.12.2023, under Sections 376(2), 506 & 34 IPC, (Later on added Section 326 IPC), registered at Police Station Badshahpur, District Gurugram.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a case where the allegation against the petitioner is with regard to making forcible relationship with the complainant but in fact it is a case where both of them were having relationship for two years and they wanted to get married and they were also engaged but later on the marriage could not take place. He further submitted that at one point of time, there was even a compromise between the parties, regarding which, an affidavit was also executed by the complainant vide Annexure P-3 but thereafter, the compromise could not become fruitful.

**CRM-M-6010-2024****-2-**

He submitted that be that as it may, when the interim protection was granted to the petitioner vide order dated 05.02.2024, he has repeatedly joined the investigation and has also fully cooperated with the investigation process and therefore, the aforesaid order may be made absolute.

3. On the other hand, Mr. P.S. Bhandari, learned DAG, Punjab, on instructions from LASI Beena Dahiya has stated that in pursuance of the order dated 05.02.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and has also cooperated with the investigation process and is not required for custodial interrogation.

4. Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that the petitioner has resiled from the compromise and therefore, he is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the role of the petitioner and the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also the stand taken by the learned State Counsel that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Consequently, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 05.02.2024, is hereby made absolute.

29.04.2025*Bhumika***(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)****JUDGE**

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable: | Yes/No |