

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
EXTRAORDINARY APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No.531 of 2026**

**POOJA RANI**

**Petitioner(s)**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.**

**Respondent(s)**

**O R D E R**

The petitioner is aggrieved with the impugned order of the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh; which we are of the opinion is perfectly in order, especially considering the manner in which allegations are made of molestation and sexual intercourse on the promise of marriage, which are then later settled, by the sheer coercion exerted on such criminal proceedings being initiated and continued. However, we intend to slightly modify the directions issued.

2. The petitioner, a 31-year-old woman, registered an FIR on 12.01.2024, alleging that while she was tending to her brother admitted in a hospital, the respondent offered his assistance, and on that pretext, became intimate with her and coerced her into sexual intercourse; which even according to her, she willingly complied believing that he would marry her, which he promised. She also alleged that the parents of the respondent also met her and there was a sort of ceremony conducted and then later she was

abandoned.

3. A settlement was arrived at, in which the respondent promised to pay an amount of Rs.9,25,000/-, of which, Rs.4,50,000/- was paid. The High Court found that the very perusal of the record *prima facie* reveals a *mala fide* case, especially when the petitioner is a mature woman who was fully conscious of her act and conduct. By making allegations of sexual harassment on the pretext of marriage, she had put into motion the criminal justice machinery, which according to the High Court; undermines the sanctity of the legal process.

4. The High Court observed that the Courts should not become instruments of undue pressure, leading to extortion from one party and illegal enrichment of another. To preserve the integrity of the criminal justice system, the High Court set aside the settlement and made it unenforceable with respect to the balance amounts payable to the petitioner. The High Court also directed that the proceedings initiated under Section 13B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, shall be proceeded with and if the petitioner resiles from her consent before the Family Court, appropriate proceedings shall be taken against her; meaning perjury. The High Court also directed an exemplary cost of Rs.5,00,000/- to be imposed on the petitioner and directed it to be paid to two entities, one established in the care

of women and the other, a fund established for poor patients.

5. We are perfectly in agreement with the High Court that such nefarious practices undermining the judicial system has to be deprecated in the strongest of terms. Only in the facts and circumstances of the case, we modify the order to the extent of deleting the penalty imposed on the petitioner; but cautioning her in the strongest of terms from indulging in such activities hereinafter.

6. Insofar as the settlement is concerned, we confirm the order of the High Court which made it unenforceable against the party respondent.

7. As far as the proceedings before the Family Court, we deem it fit, in the facts and circumstances of the case, to grant divorce to the parties invoking our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, finding from the facts and circumstances, an irretrievable breakdown of marriage.

8. The Special Leave Petition is disposed of with the above directions.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand rejected.

.....J.  
(J. B. PARDIWALA)

.....J.  
(K. VINOD CHANDRAN)

NEW DELHI;  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2026.  
ITEM NO.46                      COURT NO.6                      SECTION II-B

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (CRL.)  
NO(S).531/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 02-12-2025 in CRMM No. 58584/2025 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

POOJA RANI                                              Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.                                              Respondent(s)

Date : 28-09-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Arpit Rai, Adv.  
Mr. Ankit Ahluwalia, Adv.  
Mr. Rohit Lohmod, Adv.  
Mr. Prabhsharan Singh Mohi, Adv.  
Mr. Aviral Kashyap, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Anurag Kulharia, AOR  
Mr. Gyaaneshwar Joshi, Adv.

Ms. Shakshi Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Manuj Aggarwal, Adv.  
Ms. Neelam Singh, AOR  
Mr. Sameer Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Manuj Aggarwal, Adv.

Upon hearing the counsel, the Court made the following

**O R D E R**

1. The Special Leave Petition is disposed of in terms of the signed order which is placed on the file.
2. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand rejected.

**(PRIYANKA MALIK)**  
**COURT MASTER (SH)**

**(POOJA SHARMA)**  
**COURT MASTER (NSH)**