



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-66963-2025(O&M)

Reserved on: 09.02.2026

Pronounced on : 11.02.2026

Uploaded on: 11.02.2026

HARI OM

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Shalini Singh Nagpal

Present: Mr. Sube S. Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akash Yadav, AAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 10 dated 01.11.2025 under Sections 75(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Airport, District SAS Nagar. This is the first petition for regular bail.

2. Complainant 'S' alleged that for the last 06 months, she had been working as Supervisor at International Airport, Chandigarh-Mohali. Earlier, her company's Manager was Sarvesh Shukla, who had been transferred. After that, Hari Om took over as the New Manager. From the very beginning, he looked at her with bad intention and made inappropriate gestures, which she had been ignoring. Thereafter, he started mentally harassing and troubling her, threatening to change her shift and stop her salary. He repeatedly called her to the office on one pretext or the other and asked her to meet him outside. When she refused, he threatened to get her removed from job. On 25.10.2025, he called her to the company's office and



began forcing her to make physical relations with him. When she repeatedly refused, he touched her inappropriately on her hips. She somehow managed to escape and came out. Due to fright of losing her job, she did not tell anyone. Even after that, he continued making obscene and objectionable gestures, threatened to remove her from job and tried to force her to have physical relations. She was mentally and physically distressed as he was repeatedly threatening to terminate her employment and compelling her to have physical relations. He called her to his office and touched her in inappropriate manner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was innocent and was falsely implicated being Manager of the company, where the prosecutrix was serving as Supervisor. The case was lodged when petitioner changed the shift of the prosecutrix. It was argued that investigation of the case was complete and no CCTV footage was collected to prove the incident. Considering that petitioner was behind bars for the last more than three months, he deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that petitioner sexually harassed his subordinate at workplace. However, she concedes that investigation of the case was complete.

5. Petitioner is behind bars for the last more than 03 months. Antecedents of the petitioner are clean and he is not stated to be involved in any other case. Truth of the allegations against him can be determined only on conclusion of trial. Considering the principle "*bail is the rule and jail an exception*" besides all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, but without commenting on merits, the petition is allowed. Petitioner-Hari Om is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail

bonds/surety bonds to the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate/trial Court concerned.

6. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

11.02.2026
Ajay Goswami

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