



CRM-M-3819-2025

-1-

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

223

CRM-M-3819-2025

Date of Decision:- 03.04.2025

Ashok

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner – Ashok has filed present petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in FIR No.261 dated 06.06.2022, under Sections 376(2)(n), 377, 328, 120-B, 506 of IPC (Section 201 of IPC was added in challan), registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak.

2. The facts of the case are prosecutrix gave her statement that she got married with Shankar son of Ashok on 27.01.2022. After few days of marriage, her father-in-law Ashok gave her some intoxicant by mixing it in food and he used to maintain physical relations with her. When she came to know about this fact, she opposed it. He threatened to kill her and her family. She disclosed this fact to her husband Shankar who in return told her that she will have to reconcile. He started putting restrictions on her. She was not allowed to talk to her family members on phone nor she was allowed to visit



her parental house. Whenever her family called her, her father-in-law used to listen the conversation. Her father-in-law did wrongful act everyday in the afternoon. On 03rd of June, she came to her parental house and disclosed everything to her mother. Ultimately, the matter was reported to the police.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that allegations levelled against the petitioner are false. He was arrested in this case in June, 2022 and since then, he is behind the bars. The statement of prosecutrix recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. is Annexure P-2 and now she has been examined as PW-3, where she has given improved version. Co-accused Shankar has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court in CRM-M-36218-2024 vide order dated 15.10.2024 (Annexure P-8). Petitioner is not involved in any other case. He is ready to abide by the terms of bail order. Therefore, his regular bail petition may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. It is pointed out that challan in this case was presented on 12.08.2022 and after framing of charge-sheet, 07 prosecution witnesses have been examined out of 16 witnesses. The prosecutrix has fully supported her version. There are specific serious allegations against the present petitioner. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on regular bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Facts of the case indicate that allegations of rape by giving her some intoxicant are against the present petitioner who is the father-in-law of the prosecutrix. Regular bail granted in favour of Shankar in CRM-M-36218-2024 (Annexure P-8) is on different footing. Said Shankar is the husband of prosecutrix whereas main allegations are against the petitioner who is father-



in-law of the prosecutrix. Statement of the prosecutrix is recorded as PW-3 (Annexure P-5) where she has confirmed the allegations. Otherwise, the merits of the case and the evidence led before the learned trial Court will be appreciated at appropriate stage. Considering the specific serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail and his bail petition is accordingly declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

03.04.2025

Sunil Devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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