



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

209

CRM-M-28730-2025

Date of decision : 12.09.2025

Vikas Yadav

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Jasdeep Singh Salooja, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.46 dated 23.03.2024 registered under Sections 346 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 363, 366 & 376 of IPC were added later on) at Police Station Sector 20, Panchkula.
2. Status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Ajit Singh, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Panchkula, on behalf of the respondent-State, filed in the Registry is taken on record.
3. Brief facts of the case are that on 23.03.2024, husband of the prosecutrix made a complaint before the police alleging therein that on 19.03.2024, his wife leaving the home for performing her job as maid/servant in the residential houses situated in Sector-20, Panchkula and she did not return home. He tried to trace her on his own level but could not succeed and express his apprehension that she has been enticed away by accused-Vikas (the present petitioner), whose mobile

**CRM-M-28730-2025****2**

number is 8957850192. 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. The prosecutrix accompanying the petitioner from Zirakpur to Rajasthan and thereafter, Rajasthan to Nepal which proves that the relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix was consensual in nature. He submits that even the prosecutrix has refused to get her medically examined. He further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 11.05.2024 and he is not involved in any other case. He also submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of total 13 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far. 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.

5. 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 13 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far. She has also filed custody certificate dated 11.09.2025 in the Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars since more than last one year and four months and he is not involved in any other case.

**CRM-M-28730-2025****3**

6. Learned State counsel further submits that the complainant has been informed about the pendency of the present petition and the date of hearing fixed in it by the SHO, Police Station Sector 20, Panchkula, vide notice dated 12.08.2025. However, there is no representation on behalf of the complainant.

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 01 year and 04 months and the facts that investigation has been completed; challan has been presented; charges have been framed and out of total 13 prosecution witnesses, only 03 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.

12.09.2025*kothiyal***(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No