IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:062738

CRM-M-14019 of 2026 (O&M)

211

Reserved on:23.04.2026
Pronounced on:24.04.2026
Uploaded on:24.04.2026

Rajesh @ Goldy

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Ranjeet Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, AAG Haryana.

Mr. M.R. Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.214 dated 26.09.2023, under Sections 64(2)(1), 70(1), 351(2), 3(5) BNS 2023 (Sections 376(2)(n), 376(D), 506, 34 IPC), Police Station Rajound, District Kaithal. This is the second petition for regular bail. First petition was dismissed on merits by this Court on 03.07.2025.

Prosecutrix alleged that the main accused was Mandeep son of Deba, Rajesh, while Vikas and Sahil had been blackmailing her by sending videos. She was raped by the culprits on 08.10.2022 in village Bhalang and was later blackmailed by sending obscene videos. On 04.11.2022, he again forcibly raped her and on 01.07.2023, he took away valuables from her house at around 10:00 a.m. She was continuously being intimidated and

REEMA SAINI
2026.04.24 15:06
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh

threatened and police was also pressurising her, no proper investigation was being done. They threatened to kill her and make her videos viral on social media, if she told anyone.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the dismissal of the first petition for bail on 03.07.2025, 9 months had gone by and trial was not proceeding at the desired pace. Petitioner was behind bars for more than two years and five months. Out of 33 witnesses, only 11 were examined and there was no prospect of the trial concluding by an early date, therefore, petitioner deserved to be enlarged on bail.

Learned State counsel has filed status report alongwith custody certificate contesting the bail application. Assisted by Mr. M.R. Sharma, he opposes the prayer for bail on the ground that petitioner's SLP challenging order dated 03.07.2025 of this Court had been dismissed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India, on 20.01.2026 and there was no fresh ground to release the petitioner on bail.

It is settled principle that while considering a subsequent bail application, the Court must evaluate the reason for rejection of the earlier application. Having regard to the hierarchical judicial system, the findings of a Co-ordinate Bench in the first bail petition must receive serious consideration. While declining the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner in the case of gang rape of the prosecutrix, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was mindful of the serious allegations of sexual exploitation of the victim by the petitioner alongwith others, by putting her under threat and blackmailing her continuously. Even though sometime has elapsed after dismissal of the bail petition, given the serious and grave nature of allegations, incarceration of 9 months alone cannot furnish a fresh ground to release the petitioner on

REEMA SAINI
2026.04.24 15:06
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh

bail particularly when his SLP against the order dated 03.07.2025 has been declined by the Apex Court not long back, on 20.01.2026. There is no convincing and fresh ground to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

The application for bail is, therefore, dismissed.

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No

REEMA SAINI
2026.04.24 15:06
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh