



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

101

CRM-M-12435-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.03.2026

Bajrang

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. S.S. Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Karan Jangra, Advocate,
Mr. Bhavuk Datta, Advocate and
Mr. Anmol Tuteja, Advocate
for the complainant.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.13 dated 23.01.2026, registered under Sections 308(2), 64(2)(m), 69 and 89 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, (Relevant Sections 384, 376, 69 (New Section), 313 of IPC), at Police Station Bhattu Kalan, District Fatehabad.
2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant- Darshana Kumari alleged that she developed friendship with the petitioner about 2½ years prior to the registration of FIR, during which period they established physical relations and recorded videos and photos on their mobile phones. It



is further alleged that during the subsistence of the said relationship the complainant became pregnant twice and the petitioner allegedly administered pregnancy terminating pills to her, as a result she suffered miscarriages on both occasions. It is further alleged that on 18.08.2025 both of them prepared document in Hisar Court and tendered into relationship-marriage, during which the petitioner assured the complainant that he would divorce his wife and thereafter marry her, but later informed her that his wife was not willing to grant divorce. It is further alleged that when the complainant stated that she would marry someone else, the petitioner threatened to make the said photographs and videos viral. Due to the alleged harassment and threats the complainant allegedly consumed spray poison on 23.01.2026 and was admitted to a hospital in Hisar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has raised the weighty contention that the relationship between the petitioner and the complainant was entirely consensual and continued for about two and a half years. It has been argued that on 18.08.2025, both parties voluntarily executed a Live-in Relationship Agreement along with sworn affidavits at Hisar, wherein it was specifically recorded that they were residing together of their own free will without any pressure or coercion. The said agreement has been placed on record as Annexure P-2, along with the affidavits of both the petitioner and the complainant, which were highlighted during the course of arguments. It is further contended that the complainant was fully aware that the petitioner was already married, as the said fact is clearly reflected in the relationship deed itself, therefore, the allegation of rape on the pretext of marriage is legally unsustainable. Learned counsel has further submitted



that the present FIR is nothing but a counter-blast to FIR No. 22 dated 23.01.2026, which was registered at the instance of the petitioner against the complainant's brother Manoj and others for allegedly abducting and assaulting the petitioner on 22.01.2026, resulting in injuries recorded in the medico-legal report. It has also been argued that there is no suicide note and no act of direct instigation attributable to the petitioner, and that the petitioner is a permanent resident of District Fatehabad, has clean antecedents, and that the investigation is largely based on documentary and digital evidence, therefore custodial interrogation is not required.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, has vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioner exploited the complainant for a considerable period on the false assurance of marriage, despite being a married man. It has further been argued that the petitioner also blackmailed the complainant by threatening to make her private photographs and videos viral, thereby exerting pressure upon her and preventing her from moving forward in life. It has been submitted that due to the conduct of the petitioner, the engagement of the complainant with another person allegedly broke, after which the complainant consumed poison and had to be admitted to the hospital, which is duly reflected in the MLR placed on record. It is thus contended that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be necessary for proper investigation. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary relief from anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully



gone through the record of the case.

6. At this stage, without entering into a detailed appreciation of evidence, this Court finds that the allegations in the FIR indicate that the petitioner allegedly maintained physical relations with the complainant for a prolonged period on the assurance of marriage and is further accused of threatening to circulate private photographs and videos, which allegedly drove the complainant to consume poison, leading to her hospitalization. The MLR supporting the incident of poisoning has been placed on record. Although, the petitioner has relied upon the live-in-relationship agreement and affidavits placed on record as Annexure P-2 to contend that the relationship between the parties was consensual and that the complainant was aware of his marital status, such a defence cannot be conclusively adjudicated at this stage of anticipatory bail. Similarly, the plea that the present FIR is a counter-blast to another FIR registered at the instance of the petitioner is also matter which requires investigation and cannot be determined conclusively at this stage. The allegations regarding threatening to make objectionable material viral and the consequential act of the complainant consuming poison prima facie disclose serious allegations which necessitate fair and effective investigation. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, while dismissing the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner vide order dated 02.03.2026, has also taken note of the seriousness of the allegations. This Court does not find any illegality or perversity in the said order warranting interference.

7. In view of the nature and gravity of the allegations, the stage of investigation, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court



is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

07.03.2026
Satyawar

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No