



208

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34220-2025  
Date of decision: 11.07.2025

DEEPAK GOYAL

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present:- Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.38 dated 03.04.2025, under Sections 64(1), 115, 123 and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Women, Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is in custody for about 3 months and the investigation of the case has been completed and thereafter, challan has been presented before the competent Court. He further submitted that it is a case where the petitioner is of the age of 29 years and the prosecutrix is of the age of 30 years and they were already in a consensual relationship with each other, which existed for about two months and the same is clear from a perusal of the present FIR itself and thereafter, the relationship turned sour and the present FIR was got registered by the



prosecutrix after a delay. He further submitted that the matter has since been amicably resolved between the parties and a separate petition bearing No.CRM-M-35814-2025 has been filed for quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise. He also submitted that both the petitioner and the prosecutrix are persons of mature understanding and the prosecutrix was also earlier married with somebody else and was a divorcee at the time when she entered into a consensual relationship with the petitioner and therefore, the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana submitted that it is correct that the petitioner is in custody for about 3 months and the investigation of the case has been completed by the police and thereafter, challan has been presented before the competent Court. He has however submitted that the allegations against the petitioner were serious in nature and therefore, the he is not entitled for the grant of regular bail.

4. Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant and has filed his power of attorney in the Court today, which is taken on record. He submitted that he has specific instructions to state that the matter has been compromised between the parties and the complainant does not wish to further pursue the complaint which was lodged against the present petitioner.

5. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

6. The prayer in the present petition is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner and he is in custody for about 3 months. The facts of the present case as stated by the learned counsels for the parties suggest that both the



petitioner and the prosecutrix are persons of mature understanding and as per the learned counsel for the petitioner, the prosecutrix was also earlier married and was a divorcee at the time when she entered into a consensual relationship with the present petitioner. Learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant also submitted that the matter has since been compromised between the parties. The investigation of the case has already been completed by the police and thereafter, challan has also been presented before the learned competent Court. Furthermore, it is not the case of the learned State counsel that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may influence any witness or may tamper with evidence or may flee from justice.

7. Apart from the above, both the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant have specifically stated that a separate petition bearing No.CRM-M-35814-2025 has been filed for quashing of the present FIR on the basis of compromise. Therefore, this Court makes it very clear that the scope of the present petition is only for considering the grant of regular bail and would not be deemed to have any opinion or expression on the aforesaid compromise so stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant because the aforesaid is not the subject matter of the present regular bail petition.

8. Consequently, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.



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.

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)**  
**JUDGE**

**11.07.2025**  
**Chetan Thakur**

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