



CRA-S-752-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

CRA-S-752-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 05.05.2026

Pronounced on: 06.05.2026

Uploaded on: 06.05.2026

RAMAKANT VERMA @ RAMAN

...Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPALArgued by: Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

1. Appellant has filed an appeal against order dated 09.02.2026 of learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide which his application for regular bail in FIR No. 602 dated 20.10.2025 under Sections 64(1), 123, 115(2), 351(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3(2)(v) of The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, Police Station Surajkund, District Faridabad, was dismissed.

2. Prosecutrix stated in her report to the police stated that she was student of GNM second year. On 06.10.2025, she went to a Cyber Cafe to fill a form, where she met Raman, who introduced himself as a Nurse in Asian Hospital and offered to give her nursing study notes and tutor her. He also gave her his mobile number. She spoke to him on the phone and he invited her home.



As her school was closed due to Diwali, she informed her mother and left for collecting the study notes. When she reached the house of Raman, he offered her water, after consuming which, she became dizzy. Then, Raman caught her and committed rape like an animal. She pushed him away but was unsuccessful. Thereafter, Raman slapped her, gave her a pill and asked her to leave. When she reached her house, she fell in deep sleep. The next day, at about 11.00 AM, her mother woke her up and she narrated the incident to her.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant was in custody since 22.10.2025. The relationship between the appellant and prosecutrix was consensual in nature. Both of them were major. Prosecutrix willingly met the appellant on multiple occasions prior to the complaint and came to his residence of her own accord. There were discrepancies in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS and her first version. Therefore, appellant deserved to be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for respondent No. 2 opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that prosecutrix reiterated her first version in the FIR in her statement under Section 183 BNSS. There was no occasion of any consensual relationship as prosecutrix met the appellant first time on 06.10.2020 and the second time on 19.10.2020, when she was raped. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 argued that appellant's sister was repeatedly texting the prosecutrix and exerting pressure on her to resile from the case. In case of release on bail, appellant was likely to tamper with evidence and pressurize the prosecutrix. Therefore, his prayer for regular bail be declined.



CRA-S-752-2026 (O&M)

-3-

5. Though, personal liberty of an individual is an invaluable right, while considering the application for bail, the Court cannot loose sight of serious nature of allegations against the appellant, the *prima facie* material against him, the quantum of punishment conviction may entail and the nature and gravity of the offences. As per FIR version, appellant met the prosecutrix only once before the incident and was not well acquainted with her. Prosecutrix is yet to be examined. Her counsel submits that already efforts are being made to pressurize her. Considering the apprehension of the prosecution and the fact that case is still at initial stage, no ground is made out to release the appellant on bail. Moreover, the appellant is resident of Shah Jahan Pur (Uttar Pradesh) and the possibility of his fleeing from the process of law cannot be ruled out. In the facts and circumstances of the case, there is no reason to differ with the findings recorded by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad in the impugned order. As such, the order dated 09.02.2026 of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad declining regular bail is upheld and the appeal is dismissed.

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

7. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

May 06, 2026

Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No