



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(216) CRA-S-2753-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 10.09.2025

Neetu Rani

.... Appellant

V/s

State of Haryana and anr.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The present appeal has been filed against the impugned order dated 21.07.2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal vide which the bail application of the appellant has been dismissed.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Nancy and reads as under:-

"To The SHO, Police Station City Kaithal. Sir, I request that I am Nancy daughter of Sanjay, resident of Rajori Garden Colony Kaithal. I am 17 years old. After the death of my father, my mother left me with my aunt Anju and went to live with another man, due to which I used to live with my aunt. My aunt used to trouble me a lot at home, due to which I left home. About 7/8 months ago, Balinder, resident of Sind (Mob. 9671368616) met me in Jawahar Park Kaithal and by luring me, took me to his hotel R. N. Karnal Road, Kaithal, where he raped me against my will and started keeping me in his hotel. During this time he raped me several times. Balinder started sending me to other hotels for prostitution, from which he earned a lot of money. Troubled by this work, I wanted to complain against Balinder in the police station, but Balinder and his friend Pradeep Kyodak (Lawyer 8222912960)



threatened me that they will sell me in Nepal and by threatening me Pradeep Kyodak also kept raping me. During this time, to avoid any police action, Balinder and Pradeep lawyer got my false relationship papers made with Balinder's friend Gagan. I kept tolerating all this for about 7 months due to the fear of Balinder and Pradeep Kyodak. In September, 2024, Balinder took me to RN Hotel. During this time lawyer Pradeep Kyodak also came there and on that day Balinder and Pradeep Kyodak raped me. Pradeep Kyodak and Balinder Singh along with other friends conspired and called Praveen Sajuma to their hotel with the intention of blackmailing and earning money and forced me to have a relationship with Praveen Sajuma. With the intention of extorting money under the conspiracy, Balinder and Pradeep Kyodak and his other friends pressurized me and threatened to kill me and got me to sign a complaint in Pradeep lawyer's chamber against Praveen Sajuma for rape and making the obscene video viral. They gave that complaint to police station Civil Line Kaithal. They refused me to join the complaint in the police station. Pradeep Kyodak and Balinder, in collusion with the police, extorted about 1.5 lakh rupees from Praveen Sajuma in my name and when I gathered courage and went to the police station to complain, Neetu Madam told me that your compromise has been made. I told Madam that I have not made any compromise nor have I given any affidavit. Balinder and Pradeep Advocate after coming to know about this incident, both of them still follow me and scare, intimidate and threaten to kill me. I do not want to take any against action them in Police Station Civil Line Kaithal because the police there is colluded with them. That is why I have come to you to lodge a complaint. Please get me justice and take appropriate legal action against Balinder, Pradeep Advocate Kyodak and their other companions. From the summary of the complaint received in the police station, the crime under sections 70(2), 351(3), 61, 308 (2), 3(5) BNS and 6 POCSO Act was found to



have been committed and the above mentioned case was registered. The initial investigation of the case was conducted by Lady SI Sunita No.205/Kaithal Police Station City Kaithal. Thanking you. Applicant Nancy d/o Sanjay.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant contends that the appellant is not named in the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. (Section 183 BNSS) where the main allegations are against Balinder Singh, Advocate Pardeep and Parveen Sajuma regarding the commission of rape against her wishes. As far as the role of the appellant-Neetu Rani is concerned, she being a police official had stated to the victim that a compromise had been effected with the accused persons and that the accused-Balinder and Pardeep Advocate had taken Rs.1,00,000/- from Parveen Sajuma in the police station for effecting a compromise in connivance with the police officials. Taking the allegations to be correct, the charge against the appellant can only be one under the Prevention of Corruption Act. A co-accused, namely, Jagbhan Kumar has been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 18.08.2025 (Annexure A-3). As the appellant is in custody since 17.03.2025 but none of the 40 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, she is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned State counsel, on the other hand, contends that the appellant was posted at the Police Station Civil Lines. When the victim approached the police station to lodge a complaint on 21.02.2025 against Parveen Sajuma, the appellant in connivance with the other accused did not take any action intentionally on her complaint and only entertained the same after 07 days after she had entered into financial dealings with the accused involved in that case who had indulged in the sexual exploitation of the



victim. Therefore, she failed to fulfill her duty as that of a police official. He, thus, contends that the appellant is not entitled to the concession of bail and therefore, the present appeal is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
6. Taking the prosecution case to be believable on the face of it, it would be a moot point during the course of the Trial as to what offence other than the one under the Prevention of Corruption Act is made out against the appellant. She is a lady and in custody since 17.03.2025 but none of the 40 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the appellant is not required.
7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant-Neetu Rani is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.
8. In addition, the appellant (or anyone on her behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the appellant from Trial without sufficient cause.
9. The appeal stands disposed of.
10. The pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of accordingly.