

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

123

2026:PHHC:049781



CRM-M-54226-2025 (O&M).
Date of decision: 01.04.2026.

RAKESH @ RAHUL

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

PRESENT Mr. Sahil Gupta, Advocate, and
Mr. P.C. Koundal, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.196 dated 18.06.2025, under Section(s) 316(2), 305,
318(4), 319(2), 338, 336, 340(2), 82 and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023 (Section(s) 318(4), 319(2), 338, 336, 340(2) and 82 of the BNS,

2023 added later on), registered at Police Station Bawal, District Rewari, Haryana.

Status report on behalf of respondent-State has been filed in the Court today. A copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner. Registry is directed to do the needful

Aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Jaldeep which reads thus: -

“I am resident of village Khandoda, Bawal and my father got acquainted with Rajbir resident of village Balpur District Kotputli, in connection of fetching marriage proposal for him. Thereafter, on the suggestions of aforesaid Rajbir, my father went to village of Solhe Kumar in the month of May, to see the bride. Thereafter, between 22.05.2025 to 25.05.2025, aforesaid Solhe Kumar shown many matches for my marriage to my father and on 25.05.2025, my father finalized the match of Pooja daughter of Hira Lal with me. On this, the middle man Solha Kumar and family members of bride asked for Rs.2,00,000/- and expenses of marriage and he accepted the same and paid Rs. 50,000/- cash and promised to pay Rs. 1,50,000/- at the time of marriage. Thereafter, on agreed date of marriage i.e. 04.06.2025, I and my father went to the bride's place at village Pati, District Ambedkar Nagar, Uttar Pradesh and they also purchased the jewellery and dresses, as asked by the bride's family members and marriage was solemnized. They also paid Rs. 1,50,000/- to the middleman Solhe Kumar. Thereafter, I along with the bride came back to our residence in village Khandoda and went to sleep in the night after usual rituals of Grah Pravesh. In the morning, found that my wife Pooja had ran away and all the jewellery and cash was found missing from the house.”

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that during the course of investigation, Shiv Kumar @ Sohle who allegedly acted as a middleman in arranging the marriage and Pooja, wife of complainant were arrested. The petitioner is suggested to have impersonated as brother of Pooja. A sum of Rs.2,00,000/- was paid by the complainant, however, Pooja ran away after the marriage was performed. Counsel contend that it is a Magisterial trial in which the petitioner is in custody since 28.06.2025 and he has completed an actual custody of nearly 09 months. He contends that charge in the present case was framed on 03.10.2025 and only 01 witness out of 07 witnesses cited by the prosecution has been examined so far and the conclusion of trial, thus, shall take long.

State counsel, however, contends that the petitioner herein actively participated in duping the complainant on the pretext of getting him married. She, however, does not dispute the period of custody as well as the stage of the trial.

Having heard the counsel for the respective parties and without commenting anything on the merits of the present case, taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the stage of the trial and the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or

indirectly.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

April 01, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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