

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18293-2025
Reserved on: 09.09.2025
Pronounced on: 17.09.2025

Bhupender

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Ms. Shweta Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
263	22.04.2024	Adarsh Nagar, Distt. Faridabad	323, 365, 379-B, 506 IPC and 25 of Arms Act (sections 120-B, 364-A, 452, 201 IPC added later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court second time under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. As per paragraph 9 of the bail petition and as per paragraph 7 of the reply dated 15.07.2025, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Offenses	Police Station
1.	31	02.02.2023	419, 420, 406, 465, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC	Hassanpur, Palwal

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“2. That a case bearing FIR No.263 dated 22.04.2024 u/s 323, 365, 379-B, 506 IPC and 25 of Arms Act (section 120, 364-A, 452, 201 IPC added later on) has been registered at P.S. Adarsh Nagar, District Faridabad, on the basis of a complaint made by the complainant/Sunita Meena. The complainant stated in her statement that on 21/22.04.2024 at about 12:30 AM, her husband and his friend namely Amit Yadav were seating on Sofa at First Floor. A boy entered in their room through the stairs and he pointed out pistol at her husband and his friend and snatched their phone and money from her husband pocket and thereafter, that boy took out a hammer from his bag and attacked on the friend of her husband, then Amit Yadav became unconscious. That boy pointed the pistol on her and warned not to raise noise, thereafter said boy ask her husband to bring the keys of car, then the complainant silently gave the keys due to fear. Then

the boy kidnapped her husband and took him away in his car no.DL-3GD-9913, Mahindra SUV. The complainant got registered the case, when Amit regained consciousness. Hence, the present case (Annexure P-1) was registered.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply dated 15.07.2025.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which reads as follows:

“11. There are total 3 accused in this case namely Bhupender (petitioner), his wife Rishika and other companion Ravinder. The petitioner/accused is the main accused in the present case who entered into the house of complainant and kidnapped Satish Meena, Ravinder co-accused accompanied petitioner Bhupender while sitting on a second car bearing registration No.HR-55-AF-8316 (Swift), outside the house of complainant, whereas, co-accused Rishika had knowledge about kidnapping of Satish Meena by the petitioner/accused and she had consent of this occurrence which is clear from the disclosure statements of petitioner and co-accused Rishika.”

REASONING:

8. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing.

9. As per paragraph 3-C of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 25.04.2024. As per the custody certificate dated 08.09.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 01 year, 04 months and 15 days.

10. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.¹In deciding bail applications an important factor which should certainly be

¹ Supreme Court of India in Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

taken into consideration by the Court is the delay in concluding the trial.—Often this takes several years, and if the accused is denied bail but is ultimately acquitted, who will restore so many years of his life spent in custody? —Is Article 21 of the Constitution, which is the most basic of all the fundamental rights in our Constitution, not violated in such a case? —Of course this is not the only factor, but it is certainly one of the important factors in deciding whether to grant bail.² Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.³ Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.⁴ When the undertrial prisoners are detained in jail custody to an indefinite period, Article 21 of the Constitution is violated.⁵

11. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the *prima facie* analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

12. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

13. Given the above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest *Ilaqa* Magistrate or duty Magistrate, with or without sureties, with a maximum bond amount not to exceed INR 10,000.

14. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, the surety is capable of producing the accused. However, instead of surety, the petitioner may provide a fixed deposit of INR 10,000/-, with a clause that the interest shall not be accumulated in FD, either drawn from a State-owned bank or any bank listed on the National Stock Exchange and/or Bombay Stock Exchange, in favour of the “Chief Judicial Magistrate” of the concerned Sessions Division; or a fixed deposit made in the name of the petitioner, with similar terms and with endorsement from the banker stating that the FD shall not be encumbered or redeemed without the permission of the concerned trial Court, or until the surety bond has been discharged.

²Supreme Court of India in *State of Kerala v. Raneeff*, SC 2J [E-SCR]; [2011] 1 SCR 590, Para 4, decided on 03.01.2011.

³ Supreme Court of India in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra*, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

⁴ Supreme Court of India in *Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP*, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

⁵ Supreme Court of India in *Sanjay Chandra v. CBI*, [2011] 13 (ADDL.) S.C.R. 309, Para 26, [E-SCR], decided on 23.11.2011.

15. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

16. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms.

17. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

18. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, complainant and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

19. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court held that “The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed.”

20. In Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

21. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

22. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

23. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

24. In Amit Rana v. State of Haryana, CRM-18469-2025 [Decided on 05.08.2025], in CRA-D-123-2020], a Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court in paragraph 13, holds that "To ensure that every person in judicial custody who has been granted bail or whose sentence has been suspended gets back their liberty without any delay, it is appropriate that whenever the bail order or the orders of suspension of sentence are not immediately sent by the Registry, computer systems, or Public Prosecutor, then in such a situation, to facilitate the immediate restoration of the liberty granted by any Court, the downloaded copies of all such orders, subject to verification, must be accepted by the Court before whom the bail bonds are furnished."

25. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.