



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

CRM-M-10571-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 25.05.2026

Mangat Singh @ Mangu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present: Mr. Imaan Singh Khara, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG Punjab.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 72 dated 29.04.2025, registered under Section 67-A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 77 and 64 of the BNS, 2023, at Police Station Matour, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the petitioner and the prosecutrix were in a consensual relationship, as is supported from the photographs (Annexure P-2) and the statement made by the prosecutrix during her cross-examination, wherein she admitted that the accused-petitioner and the prosecutrix were in a consensual relationship and the accused-petitioner never refused to solemnize marriage with her and



further that her father was the one that was ultimately against the marriage. It is further submitted that the medical examination report does not support the allegations of sexual assault and that the FIR has been lodged after an unexplained delay of about four years, as the alleged occurrence pertains to the year 2021 whereas the FIR was registered on 29.04.2025. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 30.04.2025, the challan already stands presented, charges have been framed and the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for regular bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is submitted that the trial is presently at the stage of prosecution evidence and the prosecution has cited 21 witnesses, out of whom 08 have been examined and two have been given up; and in case the petitioner is released on bail, there exists a likelihood of his influencing the prosecution witnesses or tampering with the evidence.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record with their able assistance.

5. A perusal of the record would show that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 30.04.2025; the challan already stands presented before the learned trial Court; and charges have been framed. The case is presently pending for prosecution evidence; there are a total of 21 PWs, out of whom 08 have been examined and two have been given up; and the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

6. It further transpires from the in-camera proceedings/cross-examination of PW-1, namely the prosecutrix, that she admitted that the



alleged video in question was started and stopped by her. She further admitted that she and the petitioner were in a consensual relationship and that the petitioner intended to solemnize marriage with her and had never refused the same. *Prima facie*, the material placed on record reflects that the parties shared a consensual relationship.

7. At this stage, without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that both the petitioner and the prosecutrix are adults and the allegations arise out of a prior consensual relationship between the parties. The delay of approximately four years in lodging the FIR is also a matter which would be examined during trial.

8. Keeping in view the overall facts, circumstances and nature of the case, the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the fact that the challan already stands presented, charges have been framed, 08 out of 21 PWs have been examined and the likely delay in conclusion of trial, the present petition is allowed.

9. Consequently, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

10. However, anything observed here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the learned trial Court shall proceed independently in accordance with law.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

25.05.2026
SN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No