



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

253/2

CRM-M-493-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 14.05.2025

PARVEEN

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Sukesh Kumar Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G. Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
217	24.05.2023	384, 387, 506 and 120-B IPC 25(6) of the Arms Act, 1959	Tehsil Camp, Panipat

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the allegations levelled in the FIR nor any specific overt act is attributed to him. He further contends that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and he was nominated in the disclosure statement of co-



accused Sunil, with whom the petitioner has no concern. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 19.09.2023, and after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court and conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time. Thus prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report filed by the State has opposed the bail petition by arguing that the petitioner is involved in six other criminal cases and considering the heinous nature of the crime, he is not entitled to the concession of bail and prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that that the instant FIR was got registered by the complainant alleging that on 19.05.2023, an unknown person came to his shop and enquired from his brother about the whereabouts of the complainant and threatened to settle score with him. Thereafter, on 22.05.2023, the complainant got four video messages and one text message, whereby a ransom demand was raised, failing which, he was threatened to be eliminated. During the course of investigation, the police apprehended the present petitioner and he is in custody since 19.09.2023. After the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court and the prosecution has cited 20 witnesses, however, none has been examined till date.

6. A perusal of record would reveal that the only allegation against



the petitioner is that he had to arranged the contact number of the complainant and gave it to co-accused Rakesh on the directions of co-accused Priyavart. This apart, no specific overt act is attributed to the petitioner, nor is he alleged to have made the said ransom call or threatening to the complainant. Even after his arrest, no recovery has been effected from the petitioner. The criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, could only be determined after the conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time. In the circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

7. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

14.05.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No