

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(139)CRM-M-73796-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.02.2026

RAJENDRA SINGH GALGAT
.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Lovejeet Poonia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate
for the complainant.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.693 dated 26.11.2025, under Sections 74 and 75 of BNS, registered at Police Station Industrial Sector 29 Division, District Panipat.
2. Vide order dated 26.12.2025, the petitioner was directed to join investigation. The said order is reproduced hereinafter:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rajendra Singh Galgat, aged about 58 years	693	26.11.2025	74, 75 of BNS, 2023	Division Sector-29	Panipat



2. *Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner had earlier served in the Indian Army as a Major in the Army Medical Corps for a period of about 12 years.*

3. *Learned Senior Counsel further submits that petitioner has deliberately been made a scapegoat by levelling false, frivolous, and motivated allegations against him.*

4. *In support of this contention, learned Senior Counsel refers to an inquiry report prepared by the Deputy Superintendent of Police (Traffic), Panipat, in connection with a complaint filed by another complainant, namely Rxxx, resident of B-311, NFL Township, Panipat (Mobile No. 8930020240), which was lodged through the CM Window.*

Upon inquiry into the said complaint, the Inquiry Officer categorically concluded that allegations of molestation levelled against the petitioner were false. It was found that there existed a prior dispute between the petitioner and husband of the said complainant concerning the borrowing of an amount of Rs.2 lacs. It further emerged that a cheque issued by husband of the complainant had been dishonoured, as a result of which a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act was instituted and registered as NACT/2225/2022.

Subsequently, upon payment of the said amount of Rs.2 lakhs to the petitioner by husband of the complainant Rxxx, criminal complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act was disposed of as withdrawn, which took place in the presence of complainant (Rajender Singh—petitioner herein) and Advocate Jasbir Singh Bhatia, who was representing the accused, Surinder Pal Singh.

5. *In this regard, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner places reliance upon the order dated 19.11.2024 passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Pathankot (Annexure P-4), which reads as under:—*

“Today the case was fixed for making payment as per compromise. At this stage complainant suffered a statement that he has received Rs.2,00,000/- from the accused in cash and nothing is due towards the ac-cused therefore he withdraws the present complaint. Separate statement to this effect recorded in writing. He is duly identified by his counsel. Heard.

In view of the statement, the present complaint is dismissed as withdrawn. Accused is hereby acquitted. Bail bonds stand discharged. File be consigned to the records after due compliance.”

6. *Thereupon, a second motivated complaint, again founded on false and concocted allegations, has been lodged against the petitioner by another complainant, namely Sxx, who is also a resident of B-331, NFL Township, Panipat.*

7. *Allegations in the said complaint are of a similar nature, alleging that an incident took place on 25.11.2025. However, after a delay of about one day, a written complaint was submitted for registration of a case only under Sections 354 and 354-A of Indian*



Penal Code (corresponding to Sections 74 and 75 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita). Notably, at the time of submission of the first written application, no allegation regarding the commission of rape was levelled by the complainant.

Subsequently, on the next day, i.e. 27.11.2025, the allegations were materially improved by incorporating an allegation of rape against the petitioner, as a result of which Section 376 IPC (corresponding to Section 64(2)(E) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita) was added.

8. *It is further submitted that when the complainant was asked to undergo medical examination, she refused to do so, and consequently, Investigating Agency was constrained to delete the offence under Section 376 IPC (Section 64(2)(E) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita). Thus, as on date, allegations against the petitioner survive only under Sections 354 and 354-A IPC (Sections 74 and 75 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita).*

9. *Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner further contends that the allegations have been fabricated with external assistance, inasmuch as counsel representing husband of the earlier complainant Rxx, and the counsel opposing the present anticipatory bail application of the petitioner before the Court below, is one and the same person.*

It is, therefore, submitted that possibility of a concocted and motivated version having been put forth to teach the petitioner a lesson cannot be ruled out, particularly since the complainants/prosecutrices, in both the cases, are neighbours and are closely acquainted with each other.

10. *Learned Senior Counsel also apprises the Court about the petitioner's medical condition, by submitting that petitioner has recently been advised to undergo liver transplant (Annexure P-5) and is presently admitted at the Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, prayer is made for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

11. *Notice of motion.*

12. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Jasbir Singh Bhatia, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record.*

13. *With regard to the residence of complainants/ prosecutrices in both the cases, learned counsel for the complainant submits that petitioner himself is a resident of the same locality, namely NFL Township, Panipat. Therefore, reliance placed by the petitioner on the fact that both the complainants are neighbours is of no legal consequence.*

14. *Adjourned to 24.02.2026.*

15. *Believability of the allegations levelled against the petitioner requires a deeper examination. In this regard, learned State counsel*



is directed to file a status report highlighting conduct of the petitioner in the present case.

16. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

17. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from the investigating officer concerned, submits that in compliance of order dated 26.12.2025, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

4. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed. Order dated 26.12.2025 passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute.

5. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting the petitioner(s) indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. This order does not in any manner limit or restrict the rights or duties of the police or investigating agency to investigate into the charges against the petitioner(s).

7. The accused-petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him or her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.



8. The accused-petitioner(s) shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.
9. The accused-petitioner(s) shall join the investigation as and when called by the police.
10. It will be open to the police or the investigating agency to move to this Court for a direction under Section 483(3) of BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C.) to arrest the accused-petitioner(s), in the event of violation of any term, such as absconding, non-cooperating during investigation, evasion, intimidation or inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.
11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

February 27, 2026
Ithlesh

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