



CRM-M-22079-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-22079-2026
Decided on: 27.04.2026

Naveen

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Khatkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Kirti Singh, J. (Oral)

This is the second petition filed under Section 483 BNSS for granting concession of regular bail in case FIR No.15 dated 29.01.2025 under Sections 127(4), 127(6), 140(3), 283(c), 351(3), 64(2)(f), 64(2)(m), 74 and 77 of BNS (corresponding Sections 344, 365, 281, 506, 376(2)(f), 376(2)(m), 354, 354(c) IPC) registered at Police Station Women Police Station, Jind District Jind.

2. The contents of the FIR is reproduced as under:

“Statement of xxxx d/o Nafe Singh r/o Dhamtan Sahib, aged 27 years, caste Sahsi 9992543993. Stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and do household chores. My marriage was solemnized on 03.03.2013 with Parveen son of Dharambir resident of Hansi ram Singh Colony. Out of this wedlock, I have two daughters and one son. There are temperamental differences being going on between me and my husband. Only after my marriage, my DEWAR (brother-in-law) named Naveen son of Dharambir used to eve-tease me. About 6 months ago, my DEWAR (brother-in-law) had prepared my video while I was taking bath. By showing the said video, he started blackmailing me and threatened me



that he should make my video of taking bath viral on facebook and Instagarm. Whenever my husband used to go outside at somewhere else, my DEWAR (brother-in-law) used to do wrong act with me at my in-laws house and he has also prepared a video while committing rape. Regarding which, I also got registered FIR No.395, dated 09.07.2024, u/s 354C, 376(2) (N), 506 IPC at Police Station City Hansi, which was against my DEWAR (brother-in-law) named Naveen, but the Hansi police had cancelled the said case without giving me information about the same. Prior to getting registered a case, I and Naveen had get prepared documents pertaining to live-in-relationship, which are still existing. At the time of getting registered a case against Naveen at Hansi, I was residing at my parental house. During this period also, Naveen used to make phone calls to me and used to hurl threats to me. Thereafter, 05.10.2024, Naveen brought a car of black colour at bus stand of Dhamtal Sahib and by making phone call to me, he said that you should come at the bus stand of Dhamtal. Sahib. He made a phone call to me from an unknown number and at that point of time the time was about four. When I reached bus stand at four. Naveen forcibly made me sit in the car. I couldn't see number and model number of the car. At that point of time, there were number of people present at bus stand, Naveen took me in the said car to some secluded spot, where he kept me for a period of about one and a half month, but I don't know about the said place. By keeping me in a bolted room at that place, Naveen had regularly committed rape with me. Then one day, police came there and took away Naveen from there by arresting him. Thereafter, I had come to my house. I don't know about the place where he committed rape upon me. Legal action may please be taken against him. I have recorded this statement without any fear and greed, but with my free will and consent. Statement is read over and understood and I have appended my signatures on it in the token of its correctness. Sd/-"

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR, which was got



lodged after a delay of about two months, at the instance of the complainant. It is submitted that there is no evidence on record to corroborate the allegations against the petitioner. In fact, the complainant had willingly decided to cohabit with the petitioner and had even executed a live-in-deed for the said purpose. It is further pointed out that previously as well, an FIR containing similar allegations had been levelled against the petitioner at the instance of the complainant. However, a cancellation report was filed therein, to which no objection was raised by the complainant. It is submitted that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year and 27 days.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He, upon instructions, states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year and 27 days. Investigation is complete. He also submits that the charges have been framed on 06.12.2025 and out of a total of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined.

5. Heard.

6. A perusal of the case record reveals that when this Court had expressed disinclination to grant the relief of bail to the petitioner, learned counsel had preferred to withdraw the first petition seeking regular bail, filed on behalf of the petitioner. Accordingly, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 24.02.2026. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any change in circumstances. Be that as it may, *prima facie*



grave and serious allegations of recording an obscene video of the complainant, who is married to his brother, and committing repeated rape upon her by blackmailing her using the said video, have been levelled against the petitioner. Further allegations of confining the complainant at a secluded place for over 1-1/2 months and repeatedly violating the complainant there, have also been levelled against the petitioner. The complainant has remained steadfast with respect to the allegations in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS. Moreover, material witnesses are yet to be examined in the present case. Accordingly, in the totality of facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. As a fall out of foregoing discussion, the present petition stands dismissed at this stage.

27.04.2026

sonia

Whether speaking/non-speaking?
Whether reportable?

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No