



CRM-M-65054-2024 (O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-65054-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-23.05.2025

Suraj @ Suraj Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. G.S. Khosa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0056 dated 04.09.2024 under Sections 64, 351(2), 351(3) of BNS 2023, registered at Police Station, Naya Gaon, District SAS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for 08 months and 20 days. He submitted that in the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are that a complaint was made by the complainant stating that she is a 25 years old lady and was having a friendship with the present petitioner and after a gap of three years, they met again. The petitioner allegedly took her to Hotel Mahi at Zirakpur, where he served her alcohol and made physical relations with her without her consent. It is further alleged that the petitioner possessed some photographs of the complainant and threatened that the same will be made viral. Learned counsel also submitted that there was a long relationship

**CRM-M-65054-2024 (O&M) 2**

between the petitioner and the complainant starting from the year 2022 and it was only after the relationship turned sour that the present FIR was lodged against the petitioner. However, the relationship was itself consensual. He further submitted that 05 prosecution witnesses have been examined including the complainant and the doctor and only official witnesses are left to be examined. He further asserted that although the complainant supported the prosecution during the trial but there are material inconsistencies in her statement and as such considering the fact that material witnesses have been examined and the petitioner has already faced incarceration for about 08 months and 20 days, he may be considered for 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 05 prosecution witnesses including the complainant and doctor have been examined. He, however, submitted that the allegations against the petitioner were serious in nature and therefore the petitioner is not entitled for grant of regular bail.

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

5. It is a case where the petitioner has suffered incarceration for 08 months and 20 days and as per both the learned counsels for the parties, 05 prosecution witnesses including the complainant and the doctor have already been examined. Furthermore, it is neither the case of the learned State counsel nor has it been argued that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond, flee from justice, influence witnesses or tamper with evidence.

6. After hearing learned counsels for the parties and considering the totality of the circumstances particularly the stage of trial wherein all material



CRM-M-65054-2024 (O&M) 3

witnesses have already been examined, this Court, therefore, deems it fit and proper to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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.

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**

23.05.2025

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No