



CRM-M-47938-2024

-1-

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

318

CRM-M-47938-2024

Date of Decision:- 11.12.2024

Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Kartik Khicher, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop has filed petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.271 dated 01.08.2024 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 406, 420, 506, 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Hansi Sadar, District Hansi.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Mahabir Singh gave his statement that his nephews Ajay and Jagful are involved in FIR No.225 dated 10.06.2023, registered at Police Station Sadar Hansi, under Sections 302, 201, 323, 324, 325, 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act and were facing trial. After some time Sajjan son of Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop who is his relative and Pradeep started visiting him and suggested for a settlement. He was told by Pradeep, Jaidev, his aunt Murti and Sajjan to make arrangement for a sum of Rs.14 lacs and the witnesses will testify in favour of his nephews Ajay and Jagful on the date fixed i.e. 09.04.2024. In

**CRM-M-47938-2024****-2-**

pursuance of this, he sold one acre of land to make arrangement for money. They insisted that money should be given before the next date. Complainant gave them a cheque on 28.03.2024. Sajjan and Pradeep accompanied him. There were about Rs.13,50,000/- in his account. Due to huge amount involved in the cheque the same was not withdrawn. Ultimately, on 08.04.2024, he gave Rs.10,00,000/- in cash and Rs.3,00,000/- through mobile phone to Sajjan, Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop and Pradeep. On 09.04.2024, the witnesses refused to testify in their favour in the Court and also refused to return the money. On these allegations, matter was enquired and the FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop is an old man. He was not the beneficiary, nor he is a witness in the said murder trial. Present petitioner being relative of the complainant is falsely roped in the present FIR. He is ready to join the investigation. Learned counsel for petitioner also annexed one copy of complaint filed by Sajjan against Mahabir under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act which is Annexure P-5. It is prayed that his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

4. Learned counsel representing State opposed the bail petition. Detailed status report has been filed. Pendency of trial in FIR No.225 of 2023 in a murder trial against Ajay and Jagful is not disputed. As per the facts narrated in the said FIR, present petitioner Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop received Rs.13,00,000/- i.e. Rs.10,00,000/- in cash and Rs.3,00,000/- by online transfer to co-accused Sajjan on 08.04.2024. The witnesses Pradeep and Jaidev did not depose in favour of accused nor said money was

**CRM-M-47938-2024****-3-**

returned. Considering the allegations, petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. As per facts narrated above, Ram Sawroop @ Ram Saroop along with other co-accused received huge amount with an assurance that witnesses will depose in favour of accused Ajay and Jagful facing murder trial. Therefore, there was an effort to win over the witnesses in the said trial. Huge amount is involved and matter requires thorough investigation.

Considering the gravity of offence, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

11.12.2024*Sunil Devi***(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE**

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