



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

**CRM-M-50491-2024**

**Date of decision: 14.05.2025**

**Sanjeev alias Sanju**

**....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**....Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. Parth Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Pooja Dhingra, Advocate for the complainant.  
(appeared through video conferencing).

\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J.**

Petitioner-Sanjeev alias Sanju has filed present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in FIR No.116, dated 18.04.2024, under Sections 323, 354-B, 376(2)(n), 506 and 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Kunjpura, District Karnal (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, the prosecutrix filed written complaint to SHO, Police Station Kunjpura alleging that her husband expired about 3 years ago. Thereafter, she is beaten up by her brother-in-law Kalu, Mona and Sanju. Said Sanju also used force on her and molested her. She called her father on 17.04.2024, she apprehends threat to her life. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner denied the allegations. It is pointed out that prosecutrix is a matured lady age about 25 years. FIR has been lodged with ulterior motive. She has given improved version in her



statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. (Annexure P-2). As per the MLR, prosecutrix did not suffer any bodily injury. Her MLR is Annexure P-3. His regular bail application was wrongly rejected by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 22.08.2024 (Annexure P-4). At present, statement of prosecutrix is already recorded. He is behind the bars for the last more than 1 year. He will abide by the terms of bail order, therefore, his regular bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. It is pointed out that on completion of investigation challan was presented on 15.06.2024. Charges were framed by the trial Court vide order dated 17.09.2024 and now the case is fixed for prosecution evidence. There are serious specific allegations against the petitioner. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

Learned counsel representing complainant also opposed the regular bail application filed by the petitioner. It is pointed out that statement of prosecutrix is recorded. However, statement of her brother is yet to be examined. There are serious allegations against the petitioner. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

5. I have considered the aforesaid factual position. Trial in this case is going on. Petitioner was arrested in this case and he is behind the bars since 23.04.2024. After presentation of challan, statement of prosecutrix is already recorded where she has supported the prosecution version. Other prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Trial in this case may take long time. Since, the statement of prosecutrix is recorded, therefore, there is no chance that petitioner can influence the material witness. Without expressing my mind on the merits of the case, regular bail



CRM-M-50491-2024

3

petition filed by the petitioner – Sanjeev Alias Sanju is allowed. He is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Judge concerned.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

**(AMARJOT BHATTI)**  
**JUDGE**

14.05.2025.

monika

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