



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

222

CRM-M-57461-2024

Date of decision: 22.11.2024

Vikrant Singh @ Buntty

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.376 dated 05.07.2024 under Sections 115, 127(2), 308(2), 308(6), 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Old Industrial Panipat, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in a magisterial trial the petitioner has been in custody since 05.07.2024; challan stands presented and as many as 11 prosecution witnesses have been cited, hence, the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future seems remote. It has been further submitted that a perusal of the FIR reveals that the petitioner was not named therein and he came to be nominated as an accused on a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by co-accused Vinod and Birmati, who were apprehended at the spot by the police following a complaint being made by complainant Deepak



CRM-M-57461-2024

that a honey trap had been laid by both of them and he was forced to part with a huge amount of money. It has been argued that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents which lends credence to his false implication in the present case.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from ASI Pawan, has not disputed that the petitioner was not apprehended at the spot along with co-accused Vinod and Birmati, and came to be nominated subsequently in a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by both the co-accused. Learned State counsel, however, submits that the petitioner is part of a gang which has been indulging in such like cases of honey trap and thereafter fleecing innocent persons. It has also not been disputed that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 05.07.2024, and the investigation stands completed as even challan stands presented. The possibility of the trial concluding in the near future seems remote as charges are likely to be framed only on the next date of hearing i.e. 22.11.2024. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, moreso since all the offences are triable by Magistrate, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. This Court, therefore, deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner

**CRM-M-57461-2024**

be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.11.2024

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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