



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

110

CRM-M-72000-2025

Date of Decision: 23.12.2025

RAHUL

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present : Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhijeet Chaudhary, Advocate for the complainant.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been *inter alia* filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and issuing directions to the Investigating Officer to release the petitioner forthwith in the event of his arrest in case arising out of FIR No.159 dated 10.11.2025 registered under Sections 64(1), 62, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS and Section 8 of POCSO Act and Section 67 of I.T. Act at Police Station Women Karnal.

2. Vide order dated 19.12.2025, the following order was passed:-

The present matter revolves around an alleged video made by the petitioner which has been made viral on the Snapchat account of the complainant's daughter, however, the said video has never seen the light of the day at least by the Investigating Officer.

Mr. Abhijeet Chaudhary, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his memorandum of appearance. He is directed to file his power of attorney in the Registry before the next date of hearing.

Learned counsel for the complainant undertakes to hand over the mobile phones of the complainant within two days, belonging to her husband, or the daughter of the complainant (victim) to the Investigating Officer in order to demonstrate whether any such video exists and to ascertain if the same has been uploaded by the petitioner or his family members on the social media.

The Investigating Officer shall thoroughly investigate the matter and verify as to whether any such video is there or not.

*Needful be done positively before the next date of hearing.
Adjourned to 23.12.2025.”*

2. In furtherance to the above order, learned State counsel assisted by counsel for the complainant has submitted that on instructions from Investigating Officer- Ms Kanupriya, S.H.O, that the petitioner through his wife circulated the said photographs of the victim to the father of the victim and, hence, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail and possibility of the petitioner having more such photograph and video cannot be ruled out. There are serious allegations of the minor being violated and the obscene video of daughter of the complainant has been made viral on social media account as well.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has clarified that there is no attempt by the petitioner or his wife to make videos viral rather the wife of the petitioner had just shared the said photograph or videos with the father of the victim to demonstrate that her matrimonial home is being spoiled because of the said relationship between the petitioner and the victim.

Learned counsel further submits that victim is always demonstrated to be a major and admittedly she is more than 17 years of age.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties at length.
5. Considering the serious gravity of the offence, the fact that dignity of minor has been put to danger and that there was no occasion or justification for making photographs or videos of intimate moments viral, coupled with the fact that specific allegation has been levelled by the prosecutrix that she has been violated, therefore, this Court is of considered view that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.
6. In light of above, this Court does not find any merits in the case, accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

23.12.2025
Deepak Patwal

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No
2. Whether reportable

Yes/No