



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54733 of 2025(O&M)

Reserved On: 19.11.2025

Pronounced on: 26.11.2025

Uploaded on: 26.11.2025

Deepak

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG, Haryana

Ms. Pinki Mehla, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.18, dated 22.04.2025, under Sections 238(a), 318(4), 64(2)(m), 82(1), 351(2) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, Police Station Women Kaithal, Kaithal. This is his first petition for regular bail.

In her first report to the police, prosecutrix alleged that in the first week of July, 2024 she met the accused in a Car Driving School, Cheeka where she was learning to drive car. Accused took her mobile number and started calling her. The next day, when she went to take lessons in car driving, accused took her to Kaithal road and to Armaan Hotel on Kangthali road where he mixed intoxicating substance in her cold drink and raped her without her consent. He took her nude pictures and videos and started blackmailing her. On 25.07.2024, he took her to Ranjit Hotel, Patiala



and had physical relations under threat of making the obscene pictures and videos viral. He also asked her to marry him. Out of fear, she went with him to the Court at Hissar on 26.08.2024 where he forcibly solemnized marriage. Thereafter, accused took four tolas gold jewellery from her on which he took a loan. He also got transferred Rs.2,50,000/- in account of his brother-in-law Vishal from the complainant's account and under threat of making the obscene pictures and videos viral. Accused took her mobile One Plus 11R. Then, he took her to Dubai on 20.10.2024 after marrying her. They lived together as husband and wife and came back on 05.12.2024. She later on came to know that accused Deepak was already married and had a daughter. When she raised protest, he threatened to make her obscene pictures and videos viral.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was arrested in the case on 25.04.2025 and was in custody since then. Challan had been presented in the Court and the case was now fixed for recording prosecution evidence. He further submitted that marriage of the prosecutrix with petitioner was solemnized on 26.08.2024 and petitioner was involved in the false charge of rape on account of matrimonial dispute. Petitioner had no criminal antecedents. The entire story regarding commission of rape before marriage was fabricated. Petitioner did not marry anyone before solemnizing marriage with the prosecutrix. Though, he had a child from one Pinki, that was from live-in-relationship. In this context, he referred to affidavit Annexure P-3 of said Pinki. It was further argued that entire story of the alleged rape and physical relations under threat of making obscene pictures and videos viral was fabricated and during investigation, no obscene



videos or pictures were even recovered. He prayed that petitioner be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has filed status report, submitting that even in her statement under Section 183 Cr.P.C., prosecutrix reiterated the material allegations in the complaint and the factum of her deceitful marriage, financial exploitation and threats. Statement of Pinki legally wedded wife of the petitioner was also recorded during investigation to prove his subsisting earlier marriage. Offences allegedly committed were grave and serious and bail application deserved to be dismissed.

As per custody certificate, petitioner is in judicial custody in the case with effect from 25.04.2025. He is not stated to be involved in any other offence. Investigation of the case is completed. Concededly, prosecutrix has solemnized marriage with the petitioner on 26.08.2024 and lived with him till December, 2024 as his wife. Admittedly, no obscene videos or pictures have been recovered during investigation. Truth of the allegations in the complaint can only be determined on conclusion of trial which may take long. In these circumstances, but without commenting on merits, petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

26th November, 2025

nt

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