



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

(111)

**CRM-M-36550-2025
Date of Decision: 19.3.2026**

Jitendra Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Ms. Manju Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sharndeeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Devender Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 80 dated 20.6.2024 under Sections 363, 366-A, 376, 120-B IPC and Section 6 of the POCSO Act, registered at Police Station Bahin, District Palwal.

2. The facts in brief are that the complainant got recorded his statement to the police stating therein that on 20.6.2024 at about 1.00 P.M., her grand-daughter, aged 14 years had left the house without informing anybody. When she did not return back, they tried to search for her but could not locate her. He suspected that her grand-daughter has been enticed away by some unknown person.

3. On the basis of said statement, present FIR was registered. Thereafter, investigation was carried out. On 21.6.2024, the prosecutrix was



recovered from Jewar, Uttar Pradesh. Her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C was recorded.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are that when the prosecutrix went to Jewar Airport to meet one Monu, with whom she used to talk on Instagram, she met with the petitioner, who allegedly took her to a hotel and committed rape upon her. It is further submitted that the prosecution story is doubtful as the said person namely Monu neither was joined the investigation, nor has he been cited as a witness. Even the medical or scientific evidence does not corroborate the allegations so levelled against the petitioner. It is also submitted that the material witnesses stand examined. She further submits that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year, 08 months and 26 days and there is no other criminal case registered against him.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No. 2 have vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. They state that specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. Learned State counsel submits the prosecutrix remained consistent in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C and in her deposition recorded before the learned trial Court. The prosecutrix in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. has levelled specific allegations against the petitioner that he took her to a hotel, clicked her objectionable photos and committed rape upon her twice by threatening her to make the said photos viral. Moreover, the relevant samples of the prosecutrix and the accused were sent for analysis to the RFSL concerned, and report dated 12.7.2024 has been received from the RFSL concerned as

per which human semen was detected on exhibit-6 (underwear).



6. Learned State counsel, on instructions from the investigating officer concerned, submits that in the present case, charges were framed on 16.12.2024 and out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, 10 have been examined till date. Therefore, the learned counsel submits that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

7. Heard.

8. *Prima facie* grave and serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner that when the prosecutrix, who is stated to be aged about 14 years at the time of the alleged occurrence, got acquainted with the petitioner at Jewar Airport, he took her to a hotel and clicked her obscene photographs. Thereafter he allegedly committed rape upon her twice by threatening her to make the said photos viral. The prosecutrix in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. and in her deposition recorded before the learned trial Court, has taken a consistent stand with regard to the alleged occurrence. Furthermore, the medical evidence also corroborates the allegations levelled against the petitioner. The forensic report from the RFSL concerned confirms the presence of semen upon the relevant exhibit. Under such circumstances, and considering the fact that the trial is progressing at a considerable pace, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

10. However, the learned trial Court is encouraged to conclude the trial expeditiously preferably within six months.



11. Nothing contained herein shall have a bearing on the merits of the case, and the trial Court is encouraged to conclude the trial expeditiously, independent of the observations made herein.
12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

March 19th, 2026
Gurpreet Singh

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