



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

214

CRM-M-27494-2025

Date of decision : 08.09.2025

Arav @ Aarav @ Arav Khilji

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Munish Kumar Garg, Advocate with
Mr. Tanuj Goyal, Mr. Yuwan Singla, Ms. Bhawna Thakur
and Mr. Mudit Gupta, Advocates for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior D.A.G., Haryana.

None for the complainant.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No.350 dated 20.11.2024 registered under Sections 323, 376(2)(n), 506 & 509 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (challan filed under Section 376(2)(n) of IPC and Sections 351, 79 and 115 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) at Police Station D.L.F., Phase-3, Gurugram.

2. In terms of order dated 23.05.2025, compliance report by way of an affidavit of Inspector Sandeep Kumar, Station House Officer, PS DLF, Phase III, Gurugram, on behalf of respondent-State, has been filed in the Court which is taken on record. As per para 3 of the said report, the complainant has been informed about the pendency and the



date of hearing fixed in the present petition. However, none has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant.

3. Brief facts of the case are that on 20.11.2024, the complainant/prosecutrix made a complaint to the police with the allegations that she was in relationship with the petitioner from 06.09.2023 who gave her fake promises that he would marry her and take care of her son and on his commitment, she got physical with him. In the beginning of relationship, the petitioner concealed his religion as well. In January, 2024, she found the petitioner talking to a girl and when she confronted him, he refused. On 11.09.2024, she found that the petitioner again cheated her and when she confronted him, he started abusing her verbally and physically and also tried to kill her by strangulating her neck with his hands. On 16.11.2024, she decided to move on and told the petitioner to leave her and then he started threatening for her life. She also contacted ex-girlfriends of the petitioner, who mentioned that they also went through similar verbal, financial and physical abuse but due to personal reasons, they were not ready to make official complaint against the petitioner. On the basis of the said complaint, the instant FIR was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix was consensual in nature and the prosecutrix had already got divorce from her earlier husband. On the date of alleged incident, the prosecutrix was about 29 years of age and the petitioner was about 20



years of age. He has referred to the statement of the prosecutrix recorded before the Trial Court which suggests that the relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix was consensual.

5. He further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 23.12.2024 and is not involved in any other case. He also submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan stands presented and out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined including the prosecutrix. The trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude and therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel, while referring to the averments made in the status report, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, she could not refute the factual position that out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far. She has also filed custody certificate dated 05.09.2025 in the Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars since more than last 08 months and he is not involved in any other case.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. Keeping in view the custody period of the petitioner which is 08 months and 12 days and the facts that the prosecutrix herself admitted the fact that her relationship with the petitioner was consensual in nature; challan has been presented; charges have been framed; out of



CRM-M-27494-2025

4

total 14 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far; the petitioner is not involved in any other case and the trial may take a considerable time to conclude, therefore, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

9. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.
10. 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.

08.09.2025

kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No