



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-55236 of 2025(O&M)

Reserved on:19.11.2025

Pronounced on: 27.11.2025

Uploaded on: 27.11.2025

Sunil

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Sumit Kumar, Advocate, for respondent no.2.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.219, dated 15.12.2024, under Sections 332(c), 351(2), 64(3)(a) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, Police Station Titram, District Kaithal. Section 64(2)(m) Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and Section 67(E), 67(A) of Information Technology Act have been invoked during investigation. This is the second petition for regular bail. The first petition for bail was dismissed as withdrawn on 10.09.2025.

Prosecutrix alleged that for the last 15 years she was in forceful physical relationship with Sunil son of Satbir alias Satira who had made an obscene video. Sunil blackmailed her and forcefully engaged in wrong acts against her will. He had shown the video to her husband on which account he consumed poison two years ago. After that, he would jump over the walls at night and forcefully have relations with her. He threatened to kill her and her children, called her all the time and harassed her. He did not let



her go to work and got her thrashed by his family members. Some time ago, she told him that her children were grown up and she did not wish to have any relationship with him. In the night of 7/8-12-2024, Sunil again entered her house and forcefully tried to commit wrong act. When she raise alarm, Sunil ran away from her house. On 13.12.2024, at about 8 PM, she received a call from Sunil threatening to make her obscene video viral if she did not have physical relations.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it was a case of consensual physical relationship which was carrying on for the last 15 years and necessary ingredients of Section 64 Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 were not attracted. He further submits that investigation of the case was complete, charges were framed and numerous times prosecutrix had been summoned to appear but she was intentionally avoiding appearance. He further argued that prosecutrix was always demanding money from the petitioner and the FIR was lodged when he refused to pay up, only to harass and exert pressure. The inordinate delay in reporting the matter to the police made the case weak and claim of the prosecutrix that petitioner threatened to make obscene video viral was unsubstantiated. Petitioner could not be held responsible for death of husband of the prosecutrix. Petitioner who had clean antecedents and was in custody with effect from 17.12.2024, deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has strongly opposed the prayer for regular bail, arguing that it was a case of continuous and prolonged sexual exploitation of the prosecutrix and the petitioner not only criminally intimidated her, he also circulated her obscene videos making it difficult for



her to live with dignity. She further submits that during investigation the police had recovered obscene video of prosecutrix and also voice recording of threats. Mobile phone of the petitioner was taken into police possession and was deposited in Cyber Forensic Laboratory, Panchkula, result whereof was awaited. Voice sample of the petitioner was also taken with the permission of the court and result was awaited. Though, final report under Section 193(3)(1) Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 was prepared and presented, no witness was examined in the case and release of the petitioner on bail was not warranted.

During investigation, the police has found that when the victim refused to continue relationship with the petitioner, he circulated her obscene videos, causing her severe mental trauma. The obscene video has been recovered as also the voice recording of threats. Allegations of sexual exploitation against the petitioner are too grave. The prosecutrix has not yet been examined. There is good reason to believe that in case of release on bail, the petitioner may subvert the course of justice and tamper with the evidence. Given the nature and substance of allegations against the petitioner and all relevant facts, petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail.

Hence, the application for regular bail is dismissed.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion on merits of the case.

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

27th November, 2025
nt

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