



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27653 of 2025(O&M)

Date of Order:17.09.2025

Parveen Kumar alias Praveen Saini

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Lalit Kumar Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.0064, dated 20.02.2025, under Sections 323, 328, 354-A, 376(2)(b), 506, 509 IPC, Police Station Sector 40, Gurugram, Haryana. This is his first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 20.05.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submitted that, even as per the contents of the FIR, it was alleged by the complainant who is a married lady of mature understanding that in the year 2016, the petitioner made physical relations with her by stating that he being on a senior position in the office, would be able to get her job confirmed. He further submitted that the present FIR was



lodged after a period of 09 years from the aforesaid incident, although there were allegations that they were regularly having physical relations with each other. Learned counsel also submitted that, in fact, the complainant was having matrimonial dispute with her own husband. He further submitted that, as per the allegations, it was stated that the complainant became pregnant with the child of the present petitioner in the year 2020. However, in a separate FIR lodged by the complainant against her husband (Annexure P-4), she herself stated that a male child was born in the same year, i.e. 2020 and that all the expenses related to the delivery were borne by the complainant and her family members and in this way, the complainant has blown hot and cold in the same breath and her statements are completely contrary to the other. He also submitted that the complainant is a married lady of mature understanding and has filed the FIR with regard to incident which took place in the year 2016 and although the allegations are with regard to repeated instances of physical relationship but in fact it was a consensual relationship between them and therefore, no offence is made out against the petitioner.

He also submitted that so far as the allegations pertaining to the fact that obscene photographs of the complainant are in the possession of the petitioner are concerned, the petitioner is ready and willing not only to join the investigation but he also undertakes that the petitioner will fully cooperate with the investigation process including depositing the mobile phone which he has been using for the last 09 years irrespective of any change in number or SIM card with the Investigating Officer within a period of three days from today, so that a fair investigation may be conducted.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He submitted that the allegations in the present case are pertaining to blackmailing of the complainant, which allegedly started in the year 2016. He further submitted that the mobile phone of the petitioner is required for further elicitation of truth. He has prayed for some time to file an affidavit in the present case.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate, has appeared on behalf of the complainant and has filed his Power of Attorney, which is taken on record. He submitted that this is a case where serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner, as the petitioner was in a position of influence in the year 2016, when the alleged offence was committed. It is further alleged that on the



pretext of confirming the complainant's job, the petitioner developed physical relationship with her and the same was subsequently repeated on multiple occasions and therefore he has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and has prayed for some time to file an affidavit in the present case.

Let the respective affidavits on behalf of respondent-State as well as respondent No.2 be filed before the next date of hearing with an advance copy to counsel opposite.

Adjourned to 26.08.2025.

Considering the aforesaid factual position as stated by the learned counsels for the parties and a perusal of the FIR, this Court is of the considered view that till the next date of hearing, it will be just and proper to stay the arrest of the petitioner. Consequently, it is directed that the arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed until the next date of hearing."

3. Vide order of this court dated 26.08.2025, the petitioner was ordered to be released on interim bail, on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. He was directed to appear before Investigating Officer and join investigation.
4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Poonam, submits that application for DNA test of the petitioner was pending before learned JMIC, Gurugram. He, however, concedes that petitioner had joined investigation and further custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.
5. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, as enumerated above, but without commenting on merits, order dated 26.08.2025, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to conditions laid down in Section 482(2) Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.



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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

17th September, 2025
nt

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