

2025:PHHC:065500



140

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

**CRM-M-27080-2025**

**DECIDED ON: 16.05.2025**

**RITESH****.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Sukesh Kumar Jindal, Advocate with  
Ms. Komal Jindal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)****1. Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.395 dated 14.10.2024 under Sections 287, 3(5), 351(3), 111(2)(b), 61(2), OF THE BNS, 2023, and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

*“I, Chinmay Chugh son of Sandeep Kumar Chugh, am a resident of 8/230A, Dharampura, Bahadurgarh. Yesterday in the night, two boys came in front of my house on a bike and they fired at the gate of my house. They threw a letter, on which, name of Kunal Joon was written. Then, they threatened on phone to kill me. My father was telephoned from a foreign number. My request to you is that strict action may be taken against Kunal Joon, resident of Village Majra. ”*

3. **Contention**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of Kunal Joon. It is further contended that there is an unexplained delay of one day in the registration of the FIR, as the alleged incident occurred on 13.10.2024, whereas the FIR was lodged on 14.10.2024. Counsel also points out that, as per the CCTV footage collected from the alleged place of occurrence, neither any recovery of a pistol shell or coin was made, nor there was any impression or indication of a gunshot being fired detected at the scene.

Notice of motion.

**On behalf of the State/complainant**

On the asking of Court, Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for grant of anticipatory bail stating that specific role has been attributed to the petitioner by one Kunal Joon, wherein he stated that he supplied the pistol to the main accused.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given a considerable thought to the submissions made hereinabove especially to the fact that the petitioner was named in the disclosure statement, which has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law and there is no cogent material available with the prosecution to connect the petitioner with the alleged commissioning of offence, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

5. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 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 a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**16.05.2025**

Meenu

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |