

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

CRM-M-20814-2025  
Reserved on: 02.05.2025  
Pronounced on: 19.05.2025

GXXXX ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Pranshul Dhull, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

| FIR No. | Dated      | Police Station              | Sections   |
|---------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| 46      | 11.03.2025 | Bajghera, District Gurugram | 310(2) BNS |

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 8 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.

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

“4. That the facts forming the genesis of the present FIR are that a written compliant dated 11.03.2025 was moved by the complainant Nikhil Sharma alleging therein that on 10 January 2025, between 4:30 to 5:00 PM, while he was in his Celerio VXi (CNG) vehicle bearing registration number HR 26ET 7446 and had stopped at Conscient One Mall, Sector 109, where one individual approached him and asked if he was Nikhil Sharma. The said person claimed to be from the loan recovery department. It was further alleged that upon asking of the complainant, the said person showed his ID card and car loan details and sat in the car of complainant. The complainant further alleged that there were five people in total four of them were in another Alto car. The complainant further alleged that they directed him to drive his car ahead, and after taking U-turn from Dwarka Expressway a towards Bajghera Underpass Service Road, they demanded a settlement amount of Rs. 10,000/-. It was further alleged by the complainant that when he refused to

*pay the demanded money, the men slapped him and forced him to admit that his car loan installments were pending and that he was voluntarily handing over the vehicle. With these assertions, the complaint was brought and legal action was sought and on the basis of aforementioned facts, the present FIR was registered and investigation was taken up in the matter.”*

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

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

*“13. That as per investigation, the petitioner has played an active role in the commission of present crime and he along with the other co-accused had been a part of planned robberies, where the accused would first check the status of the vehicle on an online application 'Debt Definder' and upon getting the details of the owner, the accused would approach the owner/driver and would present themselves as loan recovery agents and would use coercion to extort money on the pretext of recovering the outstanding loan amount due on the vehicle. The petitioner had followed the looted car on his scooter and was a privy to the crime. The accused persons had looted the car of the complainant and extorted money in lieu of his outstanding loan on his vehicle and in this way the accused had duped the complainant to the tune of Rs. 50570/- and had also fled with his car. The petitioner acting in league with the co-accused had been a privy to the commission of the crime and had been instrumental in looting the vehicle bearing registration no. HR26ET7446. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to effect the recovery of the scooter used by him in the commission of present crime and to recover the looted amount that had fallen in his share.”*

7. The foundational reason granting bail to petitioner is his young age and he being first offender. This Court wants to afford one chance to reform. Given above, arrest of the petitioner is stayed subject to petitioner's parents giving an affidavit to the Investigator that they will ensure that the petitioner does not enter into bad company and reform. It shall be permissible for the Investigator to interrogate the petitioner in presence of either of his parents and secondly, there shall be no need to furnish his bonds as he is less than 18 years of age.

8. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, age of petitioner and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

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

**10.** A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

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

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

19.05.2025  
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.