



CRM-M-53807-2025

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

207

CRM-M-53807-2025

Date of Decision: 12.11.2025

MAYANK ALIAS MAYANK DUDEJA

... Petitioner

VERSUS**STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER**

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Advocate and
Mr. Stephan Masih, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana

Mr. Mukesh Rao, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Aneja, Advocate for respondent No. 2

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No. 71 dated 22.02.2025 under Sections 376(2)(n), 506, 120-B, 34 of Indian Penal Code, Section 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and Section 67-A of Information Technology Act, 2000, Police Station Urban Estate, District Hisar. Sections 232(1), 253(b) of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 have been added in the FIR during investigation.

2. Prosecutrix alleged that she was resident of Hisar and her date of birth was 18.12.2005. She was a college student. Accused Aryan Jain and Parshant Bishnoi were also studying in the same college. Accused Parshant Bishnoi introduced her to Aryan Jain in September 2023 and they both conspired to trap her in their friendship. On 12.10.2023, accused Aryan Jain took her to a Hotel in Hisar, where he raped her against her wish. When she started weeping, he told her



that he would would marry her and she should not disclose the matter. Out of fear she did not inform her family members. Accused Aryan Jain made obscene photos and videos and raped her by threatening to make them viral. On 29.11.2023, he called her again to a Hotel and when she refused, he showed her the obscene videos and photos on his phone and threatened to upload them, ruin her life and get her killed. Out of fear and stress, she did not disclose the incident and started contemplating suicide. She refused to talk to Aryan Jain and asked him not to disturb her life. Her neighbour Prashant Bishnoi connived with accused Aryan Jain under a conspiracy and made a conference call to her by deception. They both threatened to make the video viral if she did not meet Aryan Jain. She refused to meet both of them and never met them again.

3. She further alleged that during this period, as per conspiracy of Aryan Jain and Parshant Bishnoi, accused Mayank became acquainted with her through social media and cleverly took her mobile number. On 07.02.2024, Mayank called her to bus stand near her house on the pretext of sitting in a park and took her to a hotel. When she refused, he said he would marry her. She told him everything about Aryan Jain, he again expressed that he wanted to marry her. Whenever he came to Hisar, he used to stay in that hotel and took her along by luring her. By deceiving her, accused Mayank took her to Hotel Desire on 22.03.2024, expressed love and said he wanted to marry her. Thereafter, he made physical relations with her. Whenever he came to Hisar, he used to call her to the hotel and had physical relations with her on the pretext of marrying her and also took her nude photographs with his phone. He asked for her dirty photos on WhatsApp and used to talk dirty, obscene and lustful things. He told her that he had also been speaking with Aryan and Aryan was his friend. Mayank also used to speak



obscenely about her mother. He stayed at Hisar on 08.10.2024 and 09.10.2024 and physically exploited her. He used to ask for her obscene videos and photos by luring her on the promise of marriage. When she refused, he threatened not to marry her and to make her obscene videos viral. Out of fear, she did as he said. On 18.02.2025, she talked to Mayank about marriage and asked him to speak to his family. Accused Mayank then refused to marry her. On 20.02.2025 he told her that their task was complete and that he alongwith Aryan Jain Parshant Bishnoi made her video viral on the internet long time back. When she informed her uncle about the matter, he found her videos and photos posted in around 15-20 porn websites. She and her family were put to shame. Now the accused were threatening to kill her. The accused were a part of a gang engaged in illegal business of earning money by trapping girls like her and making obscene videos and photographs.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner was resident of Sonipat, whereas prosecutrix was residing in Hisar. They met for the first time on 07.02.2024 when prosecutrix had attained the age of majority. He further submits that it was a clear case of consensual sexual relationship and there was no occasion for the petitioner to make promise of marriage on the first meeting. He further argues that the police also found no connection between Mayank and Aryan Jain and petitioner had been challaned only under Seciton 376(2)(n) IPC. The obscene videos of the petitioner were made viral by Aryan Jain and not by the petitioner, who was in judicial custody for the last seven months and deserves to be enlarged on regular bail.

5. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that the investigation was complete



CRM-M-53807-2025

4

and challan was presented against the petitioner under Section 376(2)(n) and 506 IPC. During investigation, an applicaiton was moved by father of the prosecutrix alleging that the accused was pressurizing him to withdraw the case. Charges were framed against the petitioner vide order dated 20.08.2025 for commission of offences under Secitons 376, 376(2)(n), 506, 120-B and 34 IPC and now the case was pending for 08.01.2026 for prosecution evidence. He further submits that mobile phone of the petitioner was recovered wherein obscene photos and videos of the prosecutrix were captured. Out of 13 witnesses cited in the case, none has been examined in the trial.

6. The case relates to continous and repeated sexual exploitation of the prosecutrix before and after she attained the age of majority by petitioner and one another. In her statment under Section 183 BNS recorded by the police, prosecutrix has alleged that on 08.10.2024, peittioner had sex with her by tying her hands and gave her beatings and made her photos and videos viral on porn sites. The allegations are serious and in case of release of the petitoner on bail, there is apprehension that the petitioner may try to influence the witnesses and tamper with evidence. None of the material witnesses have yet been recorded. To ensure fair trial, the witnesses must be in a position to depose without any fear. Possibility of the petitioner interdicting fair trial, in the event of release on bail can not be ruled out. Considering all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, no ground is made out to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petition stands dismissed.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

November 12, 2025.

reena

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