



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18643 of 2025 (O&M)

Reserved on: 27.08.2025

Date of Order:28.08.2025

Sandeep

.Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, AAG, Haryana

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.43 dated 05.02.2024, under Section 6 and 14 of Protection of Children From Sexual Offence Act, 2012, under Section 506, 376(2)(n), 376(3) IPC and Section 67/67-A of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa, Haryana. This is his second application for regular bail. The first application was dismissed as withdrawn on 29.08.2024.

FIR in the case was registered on complaint of prosecutrix , who stated that she was a student of Class 10. Around 11 months ago, she became friendly with Sandeep Soni son of Ramswaroop Soni, who took her in confidence and had physical relations with her without her wish. At that time, he made an obscene video. In the month of August, 2023, he again started calling her and asked her for physical relations. When she refused, he displayed the obscene video and compelled her to have physical relations. In the month of October, Sandeep Soni called her. He was accompanied by



his brother Mohit. Sandeep Soni pressurized her to have physical relations with his brother, threatening to make her video viral, if she refused. He parked his car in an abandoned place and went out. Mohit had physical relations with her forcibly under threat of death. Mohit often called her on holidays and sexually exploited her against her wish under threat of making her video viral. Sandeep Soni too had physical relations with her under threat of making video viral. He sent the video to her uncle's son who remained quite for fear of humiliation. Disturbed and harassed, she confided in her mother. Her brother also told her about the viral video.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that during investigation of the case, the police found version of the prosecutrix false and Mohit Soni son of Ramswaroop Soni was let off as he was not found involved. He further submitted that semen could not be detected on any of the exhibits sent for FSL examination. Referring to another report of FSL on record, he argued that no WhatsApp message relating to mobile number of the prosecutrix were found/retrieved from the telephone of the petitioner. It was urged that the prosecutrix had since been examined in the case and there was no apprehension of the petitioner threatening her. It was submitted that the petitioner was in custody for the last 01 year 04 months and deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel placed on record custody certificate. He , however, strongly opposed the application for bail submitting that out of 22 witnesses, only 7 witnesses had been examined. He further submitted that the prosecutrix had fully supported prosecution case as against the petitioner and considering the seriousness of the allegations, petitioner did not deserve



to be enlarged on bail.

Mother of the prosecutrix, who was present at the time of hearing of the bail application, submitted that her daughter's obscene videos were still being circulated bringing shame and humiliation to the family, so the bail application be declined.

There are specific and serious allegations against the petitioner. Considering the gravity of the offence, the manner in which the crime is alleged to have been committed, the role attributed to the petitioner, it is not a fit case to grant regular bail. The application for regular bail is dismissed.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion on merits of the case

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

28th August, 2025
nt

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