



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

CRM-M-26133-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.05.2026

Karan @ Karan Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Gurdeep Kaur, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.213 dated 26.06.2025 under Sections 137 and 96 of the BNS (Sections 64(2)(h) of the BNS and Section 6 of the POCSO Act were added during investigation), registered at Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR and that the prosecutrix and the petitioner were in a mutual consensual relationship. It is contended that the prosecutrix is now a major and has duly executed an affidavit dated



18.04.2026 (Annexure P-2), wherein she has stated that her parents wanted her to marry an elderly man, whereas she intended to pursue further studies. It is further submitted that the prosecutrix has specifically stated that the present FIR was got registered by her father against the petitioner falsely, out of spite and animosity. Learned counsel further submits that the prosecutrix and the petitioner, without any threat, coercion or undue influence, have duly executed a live-in relationship deed dated 10.04.2026 (Annexure P-3), the sole purpose whereof was to reflect the consensual nature of the relationship between the parties. It is further contended that the prosecutrix and the petitioner are expecting a child and intend to reside together as a family. Therefore, prayer has been made for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2-prosecutrix submits that she has no objection in case the concession of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, as she is presently residing with her father-in-law and is carrying the petitioner's child. It is further submitted that she is approximately 22 weeks pregnant and intends to reside with the petitioner as a family.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while opposing the present petition, submits that the allegations levelled in the FIR are serious in nature and involve offences under the provisions of the BNS as well as the POCSO Act. However, it is not disputed that the prosecutrix is presently a major, and is residing with the family of the petitioner and is carrying the child of the petitioner.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the paper-book.

6. A perusal of the record would show that the relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix was consensual in nature. The prosecutrix, who is now major, has categorically supported the case of the petitioner and has stated before this Court that she is residing with the petitioner of her own free will. The affidavit placed on record by the prosecutrix as well as the live-in relationship deed *prima facie* reflect the consensual nature of the relationship between the parties.

7. This Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that the prosecutrix is carrying the child of the petitioner and both parties intend to reside together as a family. The factum of pregnancy and cohabitation between the parties has not been disputed by the State.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the nature of allegations, the stand taken by the prosecutrix, the stage of trial and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

9. Consequently, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

2026:PHHC:084811



CRM-M-26133-2026

-4-

10. Nothing observed here-in-above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed independently in accordance with law.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

27.05.2026
SN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No