



101 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH**
CRM-M-54119-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 24.09.2025

SUNDER LAL

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Mandhir S. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 140 dated 04.09.2025 under Sections 351(2), 64(1) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Farakpur, District Yamunanagar. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

Case was registered on complaint of prosecutrix, who alleged that she met the accused at a *Dhaba* on 12.06.2025 at 7.00 PM. Accused came in his Bolero car and represented that he had good contacts in Haryana government and could procure a job for her. She fell for his words and gave her mobile number. On 21.06.2025, accused called her in front of a hospital and asked her to supply her documents for procuring government job. During conversation, she told him that she had a dispute with her husband and she lived in rented accommodation with her son. Accused started sending her messages on phone. On 25.06.2025, at about 4.00 PM, he visited her home when she was alone, on the pretext of collecting her papers. When she told him that her son would be back



CRM-M-54119-2025 (O&M)

-2-

by 6'O clock, he gave her a cold drink, after consuming which, she became unconscious and when she regained consciousness, they were both without clothes. When she confronted him and threatened to lodge complaint, accused told her that he had prepared a video and if she raised alarm, he would make the video viral and would also get her and her son eliminated. Accused again established physical relations with her against her wish, under threat and left. On 26.06.2025, he again threatened her.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submitted that prosecutrix was 38 years old, married lady and except her bald statement, there was nothing to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. There was no question of the petitioner procuring a job for the prosecutrix, who never disclosed her educational qualifications to him. The FIR was lodged after two and half months. It was urged that prosecutrix was a clever, shrewd lady and it was a case of honey trap. She was demanding large sums of money for settling the matter and in this context, referred to transcript of call recordings between the petitioner and one Sunder, available on record as Annexures P-2 and P-3.

Learned State counsel appeared on advance notice and contested the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground of serious nature of offence. On instructions from SI Baljeet Kaur, he submitted that petitioner was a previous convict, involved in several cases. His custodial interrogation was required for just and effective investigation.

**CRM-M-54119-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

Antecedents of the petitioner are not clean. He is a previous convict in case bearing FIR No. 153 dated 28.10.2005 under Sections 392, 393 IPC Police Station Sadar Jagadhri and is involved in 02 other cases of serious nature. Benefit of anticipatory bail cannot be granted as a matter of routine, as it may ultimately thwart the process of investigation. There are serious allegations against the petitioner and his custodial interrogation would be required for eliciting useful information and the obscene videos, which he allegedly prepared.

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

The petition stands dismissed.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

24.09.2025
Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No