



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

102

CRM-M-1980-2025

Date of decision: January 23rd, 2025

Ankur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Naveen Kumar Jaglan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.340 dated 12.10.2024 under Sections 308(2), 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS registered at Police Station Sector 13-17, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, on the allegations that, in connivance with the co-accused, he advanced threats to the complainant, attempting to extort a sum of ₹50 lakh on gunpoint while threatening to implicate the complainant in a false case under the POCSO Act. It is argued that the false implication of the petitioner is evident from the fact that, despite not being served with any notice, the petitioner voluntarily joined the investigation. However, the investigating agency failed to record his participation in the investigation.

3. Learned counsel further submits that FIR (Annexure P-1) was allegedly registered due to collusion between the complainant and certain police officials. He asserts that the complainant had approached

the petitioner to explore the possibility of settling a prior FIR filed against both of them, but subsequently, the complainant, in collusion with the police, ensured that the present FIR was lodged solely against the petitioner.

4. It is argued that the allegations levelled against the petitioner, even on their face, do not make out a case, nor is any recovery to be made from him. The petitioner is willing to join the investigation and hence, he be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Rahul Mohan, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

7. Learned State counsel has strenuously objected to the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that there are specific and grave allegations against the petitioner, including that he abducted the complainant, threatened him at gunpoint, and extorted ₹50 lakh by threatening to implicate him in a false rape case. The learned State counsel has further apprised the Court, on instructions, that the petitioner has previous criminal antecedents, being involved in no less than eight other criminal cases. A prayer has, therefore, been made for dismissal of the instant petition.

8. Upon hearing the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, and on perusal of the material on record, including the contents of the FIR (Annexure P-1), it stands revealed that there are *prima facie* serious and grave allegations levelled against the petitioner; allegedly the petitioner abducted the complainant, issued threats of

implicating him in a false rape case, and demanded a substantial amount of ₹50 lakh at gunpoint, thereby advancing threats to his life. Furthermore, the petitioner does not have an unblemished record. His involvement in as many as eight other criminal cases also raises serious apprehensions about the possibility of the misuse of the concession of anticipatory bail, were it to be granted. Therefore, given the gravity of the allegations, coupled with the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, no ground is made out for extending the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

10. 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.

January 23rd, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No