

2025:PHHC:164330



CRM-M-65986-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

101

CRM-M-65986-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.11.2025

PARVEEN GUPTA

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Mandeep Kumar Dhot, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 176 dated 30.08.2024 under Sections 115, 127(2), 351(2), 64(2)(m) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station City Pehowa District Kurukshetra. This is the second petition for anticipatory bail, the first one was dismissed as withdrawn on 30.09.2025.

Prosecutrix alleged that one year ago, she visited Malaysia on tourist visa, where she met Parveen Gupta son of Shankar Gupta resident of Nand Colony, Gali No. 11, Police Station Sadar Pehowa. She had been talking with him often on the phone. When she returned to India, Parveen Gupta asked her to visit his place and not to worry. Believing him, she came to Pehowa on 24.08.2024. She was married and had three children. When she reached the



house of Parveen Gupta, she met Lalita, who introduced herself as his sister. She stayed in the house for some time and wanted to go home but petitioner insisted that she stay in his house for the night. Instead of staying with him, she stayed in a *Gurudwara*. The next day, she got a call from Parveen. He came to pick her up outside the *Gurudwara* and took her to his sister's house, where he thrashed her, punched her on her lips and kept her captive till evening. At around 5.00 PM, he took her to a hotel on Kurukshetra Road, where he sexually exploited her under threat of death. On 26.08.2024, she took her to the house of his friend, where he again sexually exploited her. On 27.08.2024, she made a phone call to her mother and her family came to Pehowa to pick her. Petitioner had been forcing her to have physical relations with him for 2-3 days at different places and threatened to kill her if she told anyone.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case was false and planted and no incident as alleged ever took place. He further submits that prosecutrix had a dispute with her husband on account of which she left home and came to Pehowa. She was a married lady with three children. The FIR was lodged under pressure of her family, who suspected her of having relations with the petitioner. He thus prayed that petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

Learned State appears on advance notice and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground of seriousness of allegations.

Petitioner is alleged to have sexually violated the prosecutrix, given her beatings and detained her unlawfully. Considering the nature and



CRM-M-65986-2025 (O&M)

-3-

substance of allegations against him, gravity and seriousness of the offences, severity of punishment conviction may entail, it is not a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petition stands dismissed.

Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

27.11.2025
Ajay Goswami

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