

CRM-M-9837 of 2026 (O&amp;M)

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

2026.PHHC.069880



207

CRM-M-9837 of 2026 (O&amp;M)

Reserved on: 05.05.2026

Pronounced on:06.05.2026

Uploaded on:06.05.2026

**Ranjeet Kumar****..Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and another****..Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

**Present:** Mr. Arun Deep, Advocate and  
Mr. Jatinder Kumar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Balvinder Sangwan, Advocate and  
Ms. Enayat, Advocate for respondent No.2.

**SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.**

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No. 460 dated 17.07.2025, under Sections 315(3) of BNS and Section 6 of POCSO Act, Police Station Palla, Faridabad. This is the first petition for regular bail.

Complainant father of the prosecutrix reported that his daughter 'M' was a minor, her date of birth being 23.3.2010. Petitioner who was running a ration shop in Gali No.1 and also worked online, came to his house on 11.11.2023, two years ago, to take pictures for Ayushman card. His daughter 'M' used to visit his shop regularly for making purchases. At that time, 'M' was a student of class-8th. Petitioner stalked her on the way and

**CRM-M-9837 of 2026 (O&M)**

back from school. He lured and induced 'M' on 09.05.2025, took her to Sector 12, Court Faridabad, changed her date of birth in the documents and married her at Arya Samaj Mandir, Faridabad. He had an illegal relationship with her for the last two years. He took her obscene photos and threatened to defame her by posting the same on social media. He also threatened to kill him and his family if legal action was taken. Accused had been repeatedly sending obscene photographs to his relatives, intimidating them by making threatening calls and sending chats. His daughter informed them that he had been threatening to kill her and her family and to defame her by posting defamatory messages on social media. They were in constant threat and under fear of the accused and had serious apprehension of some untoward incident.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was in custody for the last more than 9 months and 15 days. Prosecutrix was not a minor as projected but had attained majority, as was apparent from her Aadhar card on record as Annexure P-4 wherein her date of birth was recorded as 23.03.2008. Statement of prosecutrix under section 183 BNSS contradicted her version recorded by the police under Section 180 BNSS. Her medico-legal report did not show any external injury on her person. There was two months delay in registration of FIR. Petitioner, thus, deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has filed status report along with custody certificate and assisted by Mr. Balvinder Sangwan, Advocate and Ms. Enayat, Advocate has opposed the prayer for regular bail on the ground that prosecutrix incriminated the petitioner in her statement under Section 183

**CRM-M-9837 of 2026 (O&M)**

BNSS. As per school record, the child was 15 years of age. There were 18 witnesses in the case but no prosecution witness had been examined. Petitioner had captured obscene photographs of the prosecutrix and had threatened to defame her by posting the photographs on social media. He also threatened to kill the prosecutrix and her family members. In case of release on bail he was likely to misuse the concession and tamper with evidence.

In her statement under Section 183 BNSS prosecutrix stated that petitioner had been chasing her. He blackmailed and tortured her saying that he would marry her as and when she was 18 years old. He also made physical relations with her. There are allegations that the petitioner,threatened the complainant, as also the prosecutrix with dire consequence and posted her obscene pictures on social medic. No prosecution witness has been examined during the trial and apprehension of the prosecution that in case of release on bail, petitioner was likely to threaten the witnesses and tamper with evidence is well founded. Considering the gravity and serious nature of allegations against the petitioner who is alleged to have sexually violated the prosecutrix from October 2024 to March 2025 and all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, it is not a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

Declined.

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

**(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**06.05.2026**

|       |                           |   |     |
|-------|---------------------------|---|-----|
| reema | Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes |
|       | Whether reportable        | : | No  |