



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

CRM-M-21448-2025

Reserved on: 1st August, 2025

Pronounced on: 7th August, 2025

Rajesh @ Raju

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Shweta Nahata, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short-‘BNSS’) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.309 dated 09.11.2024 registered under Sections 140(3), 310(2), 238(a) 61(b) of BNS, at Police Station Sadar Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

2. As per the allegations, on 08.11.2024, the complainant-Rakesh Kumar was going towards his house on his scooty, when he was intercepted by occupants of a white colour car, who were three in number. They stopped his vehicle and by pushing him inside their car, covered his face and took him to an unknown road. They snatched cash amount of Rs.15000/- and mobile phone from him. They also got transferred an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- and Rs. 62,000/- respectively from his bank accounts by using his mobile phone. Thereafter, they damaged the SIM card of his mobile phone and after leaving him in the forest area, they fled. After registration of FIR against unknown persons, investigation proceedings were initiated.



During the course of investigation, CCTV footage from the house of Sarpanch of *Nimbi* village was obtained which revealed that the vehicle used in the crime was registered in the name of one Anil, who disclosed that he sold the same to one Ankit and on contact, Ankit disclosed that he had sold the same to accused Ashish. Accused Ashish was arrested on 09.11.2024. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his complicity in the crime and also disclosed about the involvement of the present petitioner and co-accused on the basis of which, the present petitioner and co-accused were nominated as such. The petitioner was arrested on 09.11.2024. He too was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which, it was revealed that the accused Arun, who was the main conspirator, had hatched a conspiracy with the petitioner and co-accused, in pursuance of which the petitioner had told the co-accused Ashish to take a car on rent, to call the victim and then to take money from him. The investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statements of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He has no hand in the abduction of the victim. No money was transferred in his account. The complainant himself had concocted a false story to escape from the liability of paying the amount of Rs. 50,00,000/- to accused-Vikram. No injury whatsoever, had been sustained by him. There is no material on record to connect him with the subject offences. He is in custody since long. Co-accused Arun, Alok, Vikas and Dinesh have since been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too, deserves to be given the same benefit. He has



clean antecedents. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be given concession of bail.

5. Rival submissions have been heard.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have joined the co-accused Dinesh in pursuance of a conspiracy hatched with him and is further alleged to have abducted the victim and snatched money from him, along with co-accused. He is in custody since 09.11.2024, challan stands presented. Co-accused Arun, Vikas, Alok and Dinesh have been extended benefit of bail. The petitioner has clean antecedents. Trial will take sufficient time and there is no possibility of its being concluded in the near future. As such, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, lest they prejudice the case of the prosecution/petitioner, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ CJM concerned.

7. Since, the main petition is disposed of, pending application, if any also stands disposed of accordingly.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

7th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*