



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

(207)

CRM-M-26533-2026
Date of Decision: 21.5.2026

Pardeep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. D.S.Matya, Advocate,
Mr. Ravinder Kumar, Advocate and
Ms. Aprajita, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ashok K. Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), is for grant of
anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.72 dated 07.04.2026, under
Sections 64(2)(m), 77, 123, 351(3), 308(2) BNS (Sections 376(2)(n), 354C,
506, 383, 328 IPC) and Sections 66(E), 67(A) of I.T., Act, 2000, registered
at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by complainant-
prosecutrix. The true factual matrix is that the prosecutrix, who had been in a
longstanding consensual relationship with the petitioner. In fact, they had
even executed a live-in-relationship deed dated 02.04.2026 (Annexure P-2).

However, when irreconcilable differences cropped up between the two, the



complainant got lodged the present FIR by levelling sweeping and baseless allegations, without any material to substantiate the same. Moreover, no specific date, time or place of the alleged incident has been mentioned in the FIR. It is submitted that the instant case is a classic example of a consensual relationship turning sour. The prosecutrix was well within the knowledge of marital status of the petitioner and that the prosecution story with regard to allurements and intoxication is an afterthought. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate.

3. Status report dated 19.5.2026 by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police (Guhla), Kaithal has been filed by the State, which is taken on record.

4. *Per contra*, the learned State counsel as well as the learned counsel for the complainant oppose the present petition. It is submitted that specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, that he made false promises to the prosecutrix and lured her into a relationship, despite being a married man having two children from his wedlock. The petitioner is also alleged to have captured obscene videos and photographs of the complainant after administering intoxicating substances to her, and thereafter blackmailed her into maintaining physical relations with him.

5. Learned State counsel while placing reliance on the status report dated 19.5.2026 submits that the statement of the prosecutrix under Section 183 of BNSS has been recorded, wherein she has leveled specific allegations against the petitioner. The relevant portion of the said statement is reproduced as under:-

“X X X X

I came into contact with Pardeep in the year 2018 and initially we only used to talk to each other. In 2022, he told me that he wanted to meet me and I agreed to meet him normally. In December 2022,



Pardeep came to my house and established sexual relations with me with my consent, and he also clicked some normal photographs of me. After a few days, he again asked to meet me, but I refused. Thereupon, he threatened me by saying that he had my photographs and would show them to my family members. In January 2023, I met him again and he forcibly established sexual relations with me. Thereafter, we continued talking over the phone. In December 2024, he again asked me to meet him and established sexual relations with me. In March 2025, he gave me a keypad mobile phone along with a SIM card and told me that I should speak to him only through that phone. On 26 December 2025, he again established sexual relations with me and also clicked photographs. He threatened me that if I disclosed anything to anyone, he would make my photographs viral. Thereafter, when I stopped talking to him, he started making phone calls to my uncle. He used to call my uncle and falsely say that my uncle was having an affair with a girl. Subsequently, my uncle lodged a complaint against him. On 2 April 2026, when I had come to Cheeka, he made me sit in his car and took me to Kaithal. There, he gave me something like a toffee to eat, after which I started having a headache, and he obtained my signatures on some documents. Thereafter, when we came out of Kaithal Court, my other uncle, who works as a driver for a Judge, saw us and rescued me from Pardeep and took me back home. After reaching home, I disclosed the entire incident to my family members. ”

6. Learned State counsel while placing reliance on the status report submits that during the course of investigation, it has come on record that the accused, with an intention to evade legal consequences and create false evidence in his favour, forcibly obtained signatures of the victim on a purported live-in relationship agreement dated 2.4.2026 against her free will and consent. The said document was allegedly executed under pressure, intimidation and coercion only to give a colour of consent to illegal acts committed by the petitioner and to escape from legal proceedings. It is further submitted that recovery of mobile phone and other electronic devices allegedly used in commission of offence are still pending. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for retrieval of obscene videos/photos, extraction of digital evidence, and verification of chats, call records and social media accounts allegedly used for threatening and



7. Accordingly, it is prayed that keeping in view gravity of offences, the present petition be dismissed.

8. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

9. *Prima facie*, there are serious allegations against the petitioner, who is a married man having children, of influenced the prosecutrix into entering a relationship with him, whereafter he allegedly committed rape upon her. The petitioner is also alleged to have captured obscene videos and photographs, and thereafter blackmailed her using the same for continuing physical relations with him. The said allegations have been reiterated in the statement of the prosecutrix recorded under Section 183 of BNSS. In view of these facts, this Court is not inclined to grant the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

10. The position of law is settled that the concession of anticipatory bail, which is an extraordinary relief, cannot be granted on the mere asking of the petitioner. There must be an existence of exception circumstances in their favour so as to warrant the Court to extend this concession. Regrettably, there is nothing in the pleadings made on behalf of the petitioner, so as to make out the existence of any such exception circumstances in his favour and make him entitled for grant of concession of anticipatory bail.

11. Therefore, having regard to the gravity of the alleged offences and the *prima faice* material on record, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, since grant of such relief at this stage might prejudice a free, fair and effective investigation.

12. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

13. Needless to say that nothing observed hereinabove shall be



construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

14. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

May 21st, 2026
Gurpreet Singh

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