

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:048021



CRM-M-16617 of 2026(O&M)

Date of Order:25.03.2026

Kanwal Anand

..Petitioner

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Sylvester Stephen, Advocate

Mr. Varun Bhatt, Addl. AG with
Mr. Akash Soni, Advocate and
Mr. Sahil Lohan, Advocate for U.T. Chandigarh/respondent.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.81 dated 17.10.2025, under Sections 74, 75, 64(2)(m), 70(1), 351 of BNS (354, 354-A, 120-B, 376-D, 503 IPC), Police Station IT Park 17, U.T.Chandigarh. This is the first application for anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner had been working as Facility Manager in Oceaneering International Services since 2021. He was a qualified professional with more than 20 years experience. FIR was registered on account of internal disputes and rivalry in the company. Petitioner was first subjected to an inquiry by the internal complaints committee which exonerated him vide its report dated 29.08.2025 and only thereafter, the FIR came to be registered on 17.10.2025 to harass the petitioner. There was inordinate and unexplained delay of one and half year in registration of the FIR creating serious doubts regarding

authenticity and credibility of the allegations. Prior to the present FIR, two other FIRs were registered in the same police station against other company officials. FIR was registered with malafide intention and ulterior motive to malign the petitioner. It was nothing but a counterblast and retaliatory measure. Petitioner, thus, deserved to be released on anticipatory bail.

Mr. Varun Bhatt, Addl. AG assisted by Mr. Akash Soni, Advocate and Mr. Sahil Lohan, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of U.T. Chandigarh and oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground there were serious allegations of gang rape of the prosecutrix. Anticipatory bail of co-accused had already been declined vide order of this Court dated 11.12.2025. Petitioner, therefore, did not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

The FIR has been registered on complaint of one 'P' an employee of the Company where the petitioner was working as Facility Manager. Broadly, allegations against him are that he in May/June 2024, he along with Sandeep Rawal took the prosecutrix to her house on the pretext of some work and they committed rape upon her one after the other. Thereafter, they would take her to the room of the co-accused where again they raped her under threat. Considering the nature and gravity of allegations against the petitioner, no ground for release on anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

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

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

25.03.2026

reema

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No