



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

**CRM-M-7874-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:07.05.2025**

Ravi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Vaibhav Parashar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana

\*\*\*\*\*

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

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.40 dated 14.05.2024 under Sections 354, 354-A, 328, 376 and 522 of IPC, registered at Police Station Women, Central Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for about 11 months and 22 days. He submitted that charges in the present case have been framed on 13.12.2024 but till date no prosecution witness has been examined. He further asserted that the prosecutrix-victim is not coming forth for deposing before the trial Court. He also submitted that allegations under Section 376 of IPC are not made out, as no offence of rape was committed even as per the allegations and therefore, the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.



3. On the other hand, learned State counsel submitted that insofar as the custody of the petitioner is concerned, the same is correct and it is also correct that the charges in the present case were framed on 13.12.2024 but till date no prosecution witness has been examined. He further submitted that the petitioner is not entitled for grant of regular bail, considering the seriousness of the offence and the stage of the trial, wherein even the victim has not been examined. He further submitted that there is reasonable apprehension that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may not only abscond or flee from justice but may also influence the witnesses as he belongs to District Badau, Uttar Pradesh. As regard the allegations, he submitted that at Delhi Railway Station, the petitioner had administered an intoxicating substance to the victim and attempted to rape her by removing her clothes. Subsequently, she was found at the Metro Station in Faridabad and as such considering the gravity and seriousness of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

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

5. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for about 11 months and 22 days and as per learned counsel for the parties, none of the prosecution witnesses have been examined till date. An apprehension has been expressed by learned State counsel that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond from justice as he belongs to District Badau, Uttar Pradesh.

6. The allegations contained in the present FIR against the petitioner are pertaining to administering an intoxicating substance to the victim at Delhi Railway Station followed by an attempt to commit rape



upon her by removing her clothes and thereafter, the victim was found at Faridabad Railway Station. This Court, after hearing learned counsels for the parties and without expressing anything on the merits of the case, and considering the gravity and seriousness of the offence, the state of the trial, and the apprehension expressed by learned State counsel as aforesaid, does not deem it fit and proper to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

8. 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**

**07.05.2025**

*shweta*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No