



CRM-M-55878-2024

-1-

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

CRM-M-55878-2024
Decided on : 25.11.2024

Sahab Singh Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Balbir Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.234 dated 22.10.2024 under Sections 115, 127(2), 140(3), 308(5), 351(2) and 61 of the BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Rai District Sonipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the false implication of the petitioner in the present case is evident from the fact that although a video has allegedly been circulated wherein the complainant is clearly visible being assaulted by certain persons, however, petitioner is not one of those persons, who assaulted the complainant. It has been further submitted that there is an inordinate delay of more than 19 days in the registration of the FIR in question,



CRM-M-55878-2024

-2-

which was registered on 22.10.2024 whereas the alleged occurrence is stated to have taken place on 02.10.2024, further lending credence to the false implication of the petitioner.

3. Per contra learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that not only has the petitioner been specifically named in the FIR in question but serious allegations of kidnapping, unnatural intercourse and beatings have been attributed to him. The petitioner suspected that the complainant had leaked out about the illegal activities of the petitioner to the Excise Department as a result of which he had incurred financial losses. Learned State counsel still further submits that a video of the incident was prepared by the petitioner himself, which was then circulated. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required in the case in hand.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

5. *Prime facie* there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who as submitted by the learned State counsel is clearly visible at the place of occurrence.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

7. However, it is made clear that anything observed



CRM-M-55878-2024

-3-

hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.11.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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