

CRM-M-4075 of 2026 (O&M)

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

2026:PHHC:082897



210

CRM-M-4075 of 2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 20.05.2026

Pronounced on: 26.05.2026

Uploaded on: 26.05.2026

Sunil

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, AAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No. 219 dated 15.12.2024, under Sections 332(c), 351(2), 64(2) of BNS, 66-E and 67(A) of IT Act Police Station Titram, District Kaithal. This is the third petition for regular bail. First petition for regular bail was dismissed as withdrawn on 24.09.2025. Second petition for regular bail was dismissed on merits on 27.11.2025.

2. 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

CRM-M-4075 of 2026 (O&M)

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 raised 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.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prosecutrix was a married lady, 34 years of age with three children. Contents of the FIR made it clear that the relationship was consensual in nature and was carrying on for the last 15 years. Thus, no offence under Section 64(2) BNS was made out. Second application for regular bail was declined as prosecutrix was not examined and the Court was of the view that petitioner would tamper with the evidence. Now statement of the prosecutrix had been recorded. It was submitted that Rohit son of Balkar had also been examined, who stated that accused sent indecent video of the prosecutrix to him but the same was deleted by her (prosecutrix). Referring to the report of Forensic Science Laboratory Anneuxre R-5, it was urged that no obscene video file was retrieved from mobile phone of the petitioner. Petitioner, who was in custody for the last more than 1 year and 5 months, thus deserved to be enlarged on bail.

CRM-M-4075 of 2026 (O&M)

4. First application for regular bail was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 24.09.2025. Second application was declined on 27.11.2025 with the following observations:

‘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, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail.

Hence, the application for regular bail is dismissed.’

5. Though prosecutrix stands examined, she has fully supported prosecutrix case. Gravity of the allegations against the petitioner who is alleged to have exploited the prosecutrix and circulated her obscene videos to her family members remains the same. Change in circumstance viz period of custody undergone after 27.11.2025 and examination of the prosecutrix, is not substantial enough to exercise discretion in favour of the petitioner, considering the serious nature of offence.

6. No ground is made out to release the petitioner on regular bail.

7. Dismissed.

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

26.05.2026

reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No