



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

222

CRM-M-18674-2026

Date of Decision: 24.04.2026

GULSHAN KUMAR**....PETITIONER****Vs.****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON**

Present:- Mr. Paras Jagga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.109 dated 02.03.2026, under Sections 69 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner and the complainant were known to each other and had remained in a relationship for a period of time. It is alleged that the petitioner used to visit the complainant and they developed physical relations on multiple occasions on the assurance of marriage, and had also stayed together at different places. It is further alleged that the petitioner made an objectionable video of the complainant without her consent and later used the same to threaten her when she insisted upon marriage. It is the case of the petitioner that the relationship was consensual in nature and continued for a considerable duration before differences arose between the parties leading to registration of the present FIR.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations in the FIR primarily arise out of a personal relationship between the petitioner and the complainant, which has been given a criminal colour after the relationship deteriorated. It is contended that both parties had physical relations on multiple occasions at different places over a considerable period of time, indicating that the relationship was consensual in nature and not forced or induced by deceit. It is further submitted that the relationship was akin to a live-in arrangement and there are no allegations in the FIR to suggest any dishonest intention on the part of the petitioner from the very inception.

4. It is further contended that the present FIR has been lodged only to pressurize the petitioner to marry the complainant, especially when the parties had continued their relationship till shortly before the registration of the case. The allegations regarding preparation of an objectionable video and blackmail are stated to be weak and not supported by any recovery. It is also submitted that the petitioner is a young person with clean antecedents and is ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the police.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations pertain to a serious offence.

6. During the course of hearing, the complainant has appeared through counsel and has placed on record a compromise deed. It has been stated that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties and the complainant does not wish to pursue the FIR or any proceedings arising therefrom. It has further been specifically stated that the complainant has no objection to the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and even to the quashing of the FIR and consequential proceedings.



7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. A perusal of the compromise deed reflects that the parties, who are young individuals (the complainant being 28 years of age and the petitioner 25 years of age), have settled their disputes voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence. The tenor of the FIR as well as the material placed on record indicates that the dispute arose out of a personal relationship which later turned sour.

9. At this stage, without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. The petitioner has expressed willingness to join investigation and cooperate with the authorities. The complainant herself does not support the prosecution at this stage and has no objection to the grant of bail.

10. In such circumstances, the rigours of custodial interrogation do not appear to be warranted, particularly when the dispute appears to be predominantly personal in nature and has since been resolved.

11. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation.
- ii. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any witness acquainted with the facts of the case.



- iii. The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- iv. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.

12. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

13. Ordered accordingly.

14. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed of.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

24.04.2026

pry	Whether her Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable	Yes/No