



CRM-M-8373-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

310

CRM-M-8373-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.03.2026

VARINDER SINGH @ RAJA

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPALPresent: Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 227 dated 30.07.2021 under Sections 376, 506 Indian Penal Code, Section 67-B of Information Technology Act, 2000 and Section 6 Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. Prosecutrix 'A' aged 17 years stated that she was educated upto 10th Class. She had a brother Jagpreet Singh and her parents were labourers. She worked as a domestic help. Five months ago, Varinder Singh @ Raja son of Satnam Singh came to their neighbourhood for building house of Sukhwinder Kaur wife of Raj Kumar. He threatened her to make relations with him but she did not oblige him. One day, when her parents and brother were away, he came to her house and seeing her alone, started raping her. When she objected, he forcibly had sexual intercourse with her and recorded a nude video, which he



threatened to make viral. Thereafter, repeatedly, he forced her to have sexual intercourse with him. Out of fear, she did not talk to anyone. Varinder Singh @ Raja went to Dubai some time ago and kept asking her to call him but she did not talk on the phone. He threatened to make the video viral and out of rage he sent her nude video to her uncle Kishan Singh on his mobile number and made it viral.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that allegations in the FIR were vague as no specific date or time of the incident was mentioned; that petitioner and prosecutrix were in a consensual relationship. The video in question alleged to have been made viral was made by the prosecutrix herself using the camera of her mobile phone. There was no evidence to prove that the prosecutrix was minor. No recovery was to be effected from the petitioner and no useful purpose would be served by subjecting him to custodial interrogation. At the time of registration of FIR, petitioner was not even in India having left for Dubai. He, therefore, deserved to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1-State and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground of serious nature of allegations. He submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required for effecting recovery of his mobile phone. Therefore, it was not a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

6. The offence allegedly committed by the petitioner i.e. aggravated penetrative sexual assault of a minor child aged 17 years, is by no means trivial.

**CRM-M-8373-2026 (O&M)****-3-**

Petitioner is also alleged to have made viral nude video of the prosecutrix and to have sent it to uncle of the prosecutrix. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessitated for proper and effective probe into the matter and for effecting recoveries. Grant of anticipatory bail, at this juncture, would amount to unjustified interference in the statutory investigational powers of the police. There are no extraordinary grounds to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The petition stands dismissed.

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

8. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

MARCH 17, 2026*Ajay Goswami***(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**: Yes/No
: Yes/No*