



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-18219-2025
DATE OF DECISION: 03.07.2025

SUJALDEEP SAROHA

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. S. Premchandra, Advocate and
Mr. Kamaljeet Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)1. Prayer

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the
Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNNS), 2023 for grant of
Anticipatory Bail in connection with FIR NO. 0669/24 dated
26.10.2024 u/s 3(5), 309(6) AND 351(2) of BNS, 2023, PS-Kundli.

2. Prosecution story, set up in the present case as per the
version in the FIR reads as under :-

*‘To the Chowki In-Charge Barota, Sir, " I, Baleram S.O Sh
Chandgi Ram am resident of Village-Nizampur, Delhi-87 and
have been working as Project Manager, in VICHITRA
CONSTRUCTION at Sonapat. Today after completing my duty I
was going to my Village- Nizampur from Sonapat. When by road*



of Nahar I reached to Ba Rakba Nahra, then phone call of the plumber of my Company came to me, upon which I stopped my Bike by the side of Road, at that time one Car BALENO, Whose No is DL2CAV 6269 and colour Grey came and stopped, after that three boys who were having tied cloths on their mouth and their hands were having Danda, they started to beat me my danda o my helmet, which was broken, When I fall down then they snatched Rs 6500/- from my pocket and tried to snatch Mobile Phone also from me. When I started to make hue and cry to save me then threatening to kill me they ran away in Car. Names are not known to me, pray for stiff action against them and make them to return my snatched money." 26.10.2024. Upon which FIR NO. 0669/24 was registered at 11.38pm U/S 309(6), 3(5), 351(2) BNS at PS-Kundali, Sonapat".

3. Contentions

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that as per the allegations, the petitioner along with other co-accused has allegedly beaten the complainant with dandas etc. and committed robbery while snatching mobile phone and Rs. 6500/-.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer though submits that the injury



attributed to the petitioner is simple in nature but opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner can be seen inflicting injuries to complainant with wooden baton in the video recorded in the mobile phone of co-accused Vansh @ Vishal, moreso, that wooden baton is yet to be recovered from the petitioner.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, as it is an admitted fact the injury attributed to the petitioner is declared to be simple in nature as is also evident from the MLR; the baton which is yet to be recovered can be recovered when the petitioner onus associates himself with the investigation moreso, the petitioner is a student of law and wants to pursue his studies further and he has bona fide intentions and is willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency within the stipulated time period. Hence, this Court finds no reason to deny the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. **Relief**

Hence, in view of the admitted set of circumstances before this Court, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below :-



‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.

The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

03.07.2025
anuradha

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