



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

209

CRM-M-51634-2024

Date of decision : 22.08.2025

Mandeep Singh Bedi @ Gyani

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Satvir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, D.A.G., Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.277 dated 13.12.2023 registered under Section 376 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Sunam, District Sangrur.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the prosecutrix made a statement before the police that she had solemnized marriage with one Balkaran Singh about 12 years back and two daughters were born from the said wedlock. Her husband had left her since five years back and she started residing in Bathinda on a rental accommodation. She came in contact with accused-Mandeep Singh Bedi (the present petitioner) and developed physical relations with him. The accused captured her photographs in compromising position besides recording conversation between them and started blackmailing her that if she would not meet him, he would make her photographs viral. On 12.12.2023, when she



CRM-M-51634-2024

2

was at her relative's house, she received Instagram call from the accused, who called her on the pretext of deleting all the photos and recordings in her presence. Thereafter, he took her at a hotel and raped her against her wishes. On the basis of the said statement, the instant FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The relationship between the petitioner and the prosecutrix was consensual in nature and the said fact has also been admitted by the prosecutrix in her testimony as PW- 5 recorded before the Trial Court, wherein she stated as under :-

“xx xx xx My love affair with accused remained smooth for about one and a half year. Accused was unmarried. It is correct that I and accused remained indulged in sexual activities for more than 100 times during that period.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that even the petitioner has transferred money to the prosecutrix through Google Pay and when the relationship became sour, the instant FIR has been registered. The petitioner has also filed a recovery suit against the prosecutrix and the instant FIR is an outburst of the said civil suit. He further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 02.01.2024. He also submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far. The trial is



CRM-M-51634-2024

3

likely to take a considerable time to conclude and therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel, while referring to the averments made in the status report, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, he could not refute the factual position that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far. He has also filed custody certificate dated 21.08.2025 in the Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars since more than last one and a half years.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the custody period of the petitioner which is 01 year, 07 months and 19 days and the facts that the victim in her statement recorded before the Trial Court herself admitted the fact that the relationship between her and the petitioner was consensual; investigation has been completed; challan has been presented; charges have been framed and out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far and the trial may take a considerable time to conclude, therefore, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

8. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.



CRM-M-51634-2024

4

9. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

22.08.2025

kothiyal

**(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No