

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

CRM-M-28296-2025
Reserved on: 09.07.2025
Pronounced on: 31.07.2025

Kuldeep ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Nitin Bhanwala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
173	23.10.2024	Civil Lines, District Gurugram	127(2)/140(2)/3(5)/308(5) of BNS

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above came before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. Per paragraph 13 of the bail petition, petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the status report filed by State counsel, which reads as follows:

“3. That the facts leading to the registration of FIR aforementioned are that a complaint was moved by complainant Umesh Chaudhary wherein the complainant had stated that he was having two sons, the elder one being Aman and the younger one being Sahit Yadav. It was further alleged that on 23.10.2024, his son Aman and his friend Ganesh, at around 9 am had left to get the camera repaired, in their Scorpio No.HR-26-PK-1962. It was further alleged that when his son and Ganesh did not return home, till after noon, he had contacted both of them on their mobile numbers and found their phones had been switched off. It was further alleged that the mobile number of his son was 96362xxxxx and Ganesh's mobile number was further alleged that 63554xxxxx. It was further alleged that complainant and Ganesh's family members had started inquiring about both of them and at around 3:30 PM, complainant's son Aman's friend Keshav called his friend Krishna on his phone number 88261xxxxx from his mobile number 96672xxxxx and told that Aman had him from called Aman's mobile number 91362xxxxx and told

that some people had held him and Ganesha hostage and had asked to send one crore rupees or else these people would kill them. It was further alleged that after that, Keshav told that Aman had been repeatedly asking him to arrange money on the phone, to which the complainant told Keshav that so much money cannot be arranged, then Keshav told that Aman had asked him to arrange 20 lakhs on the phone, after which Keshav told that Aman's call had come again and he had called him to reach at Shri Ram Dhaba, Badshahpur with Rs.20 lakhs. It was further alleged that on the suspicion that complainant's son Aman and Ganesh were that some trapped in some trouble and unknown people had abducted Aman and Ganesh and had kept them in hiding and by threatening to kill them, the unknown people were demanding for Rs.1 crore and then Rs.20 lakhs. The complainant sought legal action. On the basis of aforementioned these allegations, the registered was FIR and investigation was taken up in the matter.”

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 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:

“4. That during the course of investigation, the police party reached the disclosed location and Deepak @ Dumble and Sonu were apprehended from the spot and were arrested upon receipt of appropriate incriminating evidence against them. They were interrogated while being in custody and upon interrogation, they suffered their respective disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the commission of present crime. The motor-cycle bearing registration number HR-26-FJ-5644 used in the commission of present crime was taken into police possession. The true translated disclosure statement of accused Deepak @ Dumble and Sonu are being appended to along with the present affidavit as Annexure R-1 and R-2.

5. That during the course of further investigation, victims Aman and Ganesh were recovered from Pataudi road, Gurugram and one Sunil was apprehended and arrested upon receipt of appropriate incriminating evidence against him. He was interrogated while being in custody and upon interrogation, he suffered his disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the commission of present crime. The true translated disclosure statement of accused Sunil is being appended to along with the present affidavit as Annexure R-3.

6. That the place of occurrence was inspected and rough site plan was prepared. Accused Sunil was found to be wearing police uniform which was taken into police possession. Accused Sunil disclosed, vide disclosure statement Annexure R-3, that two of his accomplices namely Rishipal and Kuldeep, the petitioner herein, had gone to Sector 37, Gurugram while the third accomplice namely Sanjay @ Leelu had gone to bring food.

7. That during the course of further investigation, co-accused Rishipal and the petitioner Kuldeep were apprehended from Sector

37, Gurugram and were arrested upon receipt of appropriate incriminating evidence against them. They were interrogated while being in custody and upon interrogation, they suffered their respective disclosure admitting statements their involvement in the commission of present crime. One fake Police ID card was recovered during personal Kuldeep. number search vehicle One of the petitioner bearing registration in the used RJ-02-CE-7539 commission of present crime was recovered and taken into police possession. Mobile phones of all the five above-named accused were taken into police possession. The true translated disclosure statement of the co-accused Rishipal and the petitioner Kuldeep are being appended to along with the present affidavit as Annexure R4 & R5 respectively.”

REASONING:

7. It shall be appropriate to refer to following paragraphs of the status report dated 09.06.2025 which reads as follows:

“18. That on 01.01.2025, the record regarding the forged Haryana Police identity card, prepared by the petitioner Kuldeep depicting himself as a Sub Inspector with Haryana Police, was obtained from Welfare Branch, Commissioner of Police Office, Gurugram. From the perusal of the same, it transpired that the forged identity card was not prepared as per the prescribed format. The copy of the forged ID Card is being appended to alongwith the present affidavit for the kind perusal of the Hon'ble Court Annexure R7.

25. THE EVIDENCE BASED ON WHICH THE PETITIONER WAS ARRAIGNED AS AN ACCUSED - The evidence which led to the petitioner Kuldeep being arraigned as an accused includes (i) disclosure statements of co-accused Rishipal have Alok who and specifically named the petitioner Kuldeep as a participant, (ii) recovery of a forged Haryana Police identity card from his possession during arrest, (iii) recovery of the vehicle (RJ-02-CE-7539) used in the crime, (iv) seizure of his mobile phone, and (v) verification from the CSC center owner who confirmed that Kuldeep had gotten the fake police ID card printed by Sub Inspector: representing himself. **Additionally, his mobile phone location data placed him at both the crime scene and the location where victims were held hostage, while GPS tracking evidence showed his involvement in monitoring the victims' Scorpio vehicle.**

26. THE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PETITIONER - The evidence against the petitioner Kuldeep consists of his own detailed disclosure statement where he admits to participating in both the previous Manali operation (where they extorted 21 crore) and the current kidnapping incident. The same is corroborated by disclosure statements of co-accused Rishipal ransom and Alok who have specifically named the petitioner Kuldeep as a participant in planning and executing the kidnapping for scheme. The petitioner confessed to creating and using a forged Haryana Police ID card to intimidate victims, coordinating with co-accused including police officer Alok, and actively participating in the kidnapping of Aman and Ganesh on 23.10.2024. The fake police ID card has been recovered from him, alongwith the vehicle used in the commission of the crime complained of. His mobile phone location records show his presence at crime locations and recorded testimony from the CSC center owner who printed his fake ID card.”

8. The investigation points out towards recovery of fake police ID card from petitioner. This is a very serious evidence and clearly points out towards petitioner's involvement. The allegation is serious, crime is heinous and the petitioner does not deserve any bail.

9. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for bail. The impact of crime would not justify bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

10. The petitioner's custody of around nine months cannot be termed prolonged, given the minimum sentence prescribed for the offense, which is 10 years.

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

12. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

31.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.