

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

2026:PHHC:042051



239

CRM-M-9165 of 2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 13.03.2026

Pronounced on:18.03.2026

Uploaded on:18.03.2026

Rajan Sharma**..Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****..Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL****Present:** Mr. P.M.Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG Punjab

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.118 dated 23.07.2025, under Sections 64(2), 70(1), 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of BNS, Police Station Sadar, District Patiala, Punjab. This is the first petition for regular bail.

As per allegations in the FIR, prosecutrix started working in Agro Club Farming Company at Super Market Bahadurgarh, District Patiala, as a receptionist and met the petitioner, who professed love for her and made physical relations with her in October 2024, on the pretext of marrying her. In November, 2024, Rajan Sharma took her to Mini Secretariat, Patiala, on some pretext and obtained her signatures on blank papers and affidavit. Thereafter, his behaviour changed. Whenever she asked him for marriage, he

put off the matter. On inquiry, she learnt that Rajan Sharma was already married having two children. On that account, dispute arose between them and Rajan Sharma assured that he would send his wife and children abroad and marry her. He again made physical relations with her and recorded her videos, photographs and audio without her knowledge. In December, 2024, Ajay Sharma, who claimed to be brother-in-law of Rajan Sharma, forcibly made relations with her, without her consent. When she complained to Rajan Sharma, he called Ajay Sharma and his brother Gautam Sharma and under threat, all of them made forcible physical relations with her against her wish. She went into depression and left her job in January, 2025. On 22.04.2025, she moved an application at Police Post Bahadurgarh against Rajan Sharma, Ajay Sharma and Gautam Sharma which was still pending investigation. During that period, Rajan Sharma lodged false FIR No.402, dated 24.05.2025, under Section 3(5) and 308(2) Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, in Police Station City Karnal, in which she was arrested and released on bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner and respondent No.2 were in a live-in-relationship and in this regard, respondent No.2 had sworn an affidavit dated 19.10.2024, wherein she stated that she was in live-in-relationship with the petitioner for the last one month, of her free will and consent and was also aware of his marital status. It was argued that during the live-in period, respondent No.2 borrowed huge amount from the petitioner and the false FIR was lodged when petitioner demanded his money back. Even thereafter, respondent No.2 had been extending threats to the petitioner and was trying to extort more money. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was behind bars w.e.f. 27.10.2025, investigation

in the case was complete and the case was fixed for arguments on point of charge. The case was counter blast of FIR No.0402 dated 24.05.2025 (Annexure P-4) lodged by petitioner against the prosecutrix. The dispute between the parties was earlier compromised on 10.04.2025 and 19.10.2024. It was thus, prayed that petitioner be enlarged on bail.

Learned State counsel has filed short reply by way of affidavit and has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that allegations against the petitioner and two others were of gang rape, trial had just commenced and statement of prosecutrix had not yet been recorded. A prayer was made for dismissal of the bail application.

Petitioner alongwith two others is facing trial for gang rape of the prosecutrix. Offence under Section 70(1) of BNS has been invoked against him and two others. Considering the nature and substance of allegations against the petitioner, the role attributed to him, the fact that prosecutrix is yet to be examined, the possibility of the petitioner influencing the witnesses and tampering with evidence, it is not a fit case to release the petitioner on bail despite his clean antecedents and period of custody.

Dismissed.

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

reema

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No