



CRM-M-67969 of 2025(O&M)

--1--

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

212

CRM-M-67969 of 2025(O&M)

Reserved on: 27.01.2026

Pronounced on: 29.01.2026

Uploaded on: 29.01.2026

Kuldeep**..Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****..Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL****Present:** Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.103 dated 11.12.2024, under Sections 115(2), 351(3), 75(2), 78, 64(2)(m) of BNS Act, Police Station Women, Hansi. This is the first petition for regular bail.

2. Prosecutrix 'P' reported that Kuldeep son of Uday Singh was her uncle in relation. Kuldeep gave her a phone and she started talking to him. After few days, when she stopped conversation, Kuldeep abused her and started harassing her. On 12.05.2024, Kuldeep took her to a Hotel in front of Hansi Bus Stand and forcibly had sex with her 3-4 times by exerting pressure. On 05.12.2024, when she came to Beauty Parlour, Kuldeep was standing on the Chowk and asked her to accompany him to the room. When she refused, Kuldeep thrashed her and threatened to kill her family, unless she had sex with him. Thereafter he left. Kuldeep had been repeatedly threatening her.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations of rape pertained to 12.05.2024 but the matter was not reported to the police promptly and it was only on 11.12.2024 after delay of six months that the FIR was registered. He further submits that there was no allegation of rape when the petitioner allegedly met the prosecutrix on 05.12.2024. It is argued that the contents of the FIR were fraught with material contradictions and raised serious doubts regarding credibility of the allegations. The relationship between the prosecutrix and the petitioner was consensual in nature and the allegation of forcible sexual intercourse was an after thought. During the course of argument to support his submission, he placed on record pictures of the petitioner to illustrate that they were in an intimate relationship.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the status report contesting the petition. The prayer for bail has been opposed on the ground that statement of the victim was recorded under Section 183 BNSS wherein she fully supported her version in the FIR. She further submits that the case was at initial stage and no witness was examined. In case of release on bail, the petitioner may not appear before the Court or may tamper with the evidence.

5. The case is at initial stage. Prosecutrix, who has incriminated the petitioner in her statement under Section 183 BNSS, is yet to be examined in the trial. Considering the relationship of the petitioner, who is uncle of the prosecutrix, apprehension of the prosecution that petitioner would influence witnesses and tamper with the evidence, appears to be well founded. In the

facts and circumstances of the case but without commenting on merits,
prayer for regular bail is declined.

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

29.01.2026
reema

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No