



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

210

CRM-M-57473-2024

Date of decision : 05.08.2025

Jitender Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR**

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate with  
Ms. Meghna Nehra, Advocate and  
Mr. Abhishek Kharab, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, A.A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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.64 dated 31.03.2024 registered under Sections 376 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Dhauj, District Faridabad.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 31.03.2024, the complainant made a complaint to the police alleging therein that Jatinder (the present petitioner), who was working in her company Cardboard Factory from last four months, trapped her in his friendship and started talking to her on phone. On 31.01.2024, he called her at his house at Kheri Gujran and raped her and also took her obscene photographs and made videos on his phone. After that he started blackmailing her that she keep on coming to his house for making



relation with him otherwise he will viral her photos and videos. He also threatened to kill her husband. On the basis of said complaint, the instant FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The prosecutrix is a matured and married lady aged about 26 years and the relationship between the petitioner and prosecutrix was consensual. He has also made reference to Annexure P-4 which proves that on 28.07.2023, the petitioner and the prosecutrix visited hotel Happy Stay, where they made an entry in the Register along with their signatures and submitted their Aadhar Cards as identity proof. Similar entry has been made on 20.07.2023 in hotel White House. He also referred to the statement of the prosecutrix recorded before the Trial Court, in her cross-examination, on 17.07.2025, she had stated that she was a close friend of the petitioner and she was frequently visiting his house. It has also been stated by her that the petitioner never forced her for any wrong act and she did not have any video of such incident.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 01.04.2024 and not involved in any other case. He also submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far. The trial is 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 reply, 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 12 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far. He has also filed custody certificate dated 04.08.2025 which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars since last more than one year and he is not involved in any other case.

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

7. Keeping in view the custody period of petitioner which is 01 year, 04 months and 04 days and the facts that in her cross-examination before the trial Court, the prosecutrix did not fully support the case of the prosecution, the investigation has been completed; challan has been presented; charges have been framed and out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far; the petitioner is not involved in any other case 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-57473-2024**

**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.

**05.08.2025**

*kothiyal*

**(NAMIT KUMAR)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No