

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:004038



CRM-M-51399 of 2025(O&M)

Reserved on: 12.01.2026.

Pronounced on:15.01.2026.

Uploaded on:15.01.2026.

Sanjeev

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate for
Mr. Imityaz Hussain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No. 584 dated 18.12.2024, under Sections 64(2) (M), 77, 333, 351(3), 324(4) BNS Police Station City Palwal District Palwal. This is the first petition for regular bail.

Prosecutrix, a married lady aged 28 years, alleged in her first report to the police that Sanjeev son of Jai Singh @ Baleram, resident of Meghpur had been harassing her for long time. He secretly recorded a video of her taking bath through the mesh above her bathroom. Then, used the video to blackmail her, threatening her and her husband. On 09.09.2024, he forcibly committed rape under threat of making the video viral. On 10.12.2024, he came to her house, tore her clothes and of her husband and threatened her daily, leaving her distressed. Finally, she told her husband.

Her husband tried to prevail over him but Sanjeev did not stop his wrongful acts.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the first incident of sexual assault allegedly occurred on 09.09.2024 but the FIR was lodged after three months on 18.12.2024 after much delay. He further submits that the petitioner allegedly threatened the complainant by using her obscene video but during investigation, prosecution failed to collect any such photograph or video. During the course of trial, which was in progress, statement of the prosecutrix and her husband had been recorded. Only one photograph was found in the mobile phone of the petitioner with which the prosecutrix was confronted but that was not obscene. He submits that it was a case of consensual relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix and the FIR was lodged in an attempt of self preservation when husband of the prosecutrix came to know of the relations. He thus prayed for release of petitioner on bail.

Learned State counsel has filed status report and has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that though statements of prosecutrix and her husband had been recorded, they both supported prosecution case. She further submits that the petitioner was in custody for the last 1 year and 22 days and out of total 18 witnesses, 15 were yet to be examined.

Petitioner is behind bars for the last more than one year. Concededly no obscene video of the prosecutrix has been recovered from the mobile phone taken into possession. Since, main witnesses have been examined, there is no prospect of the petitioner influencing them. Trial is progressing slowly and may take long to conclude. Antecedents of the petitioner are clean and he is not stated to be involved in any other case. In

the circumstances of the case but without commenting on merit, he is ordered to be enlarged on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

15.01.2026

reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No