

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

CRM-M-32777-2025
Reserved on: 07.07.2025
Pronounced on: 31.07.2025

Dharam Vir ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
55	29.04.2025	Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib	304(2) BNS (Sections 204/ 205/ 308(7)/ 190/ 191(3) BNS added later on)

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. Per paragraph 10 of the bail application and paragraph 19 of the status report, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1.	61	26.08.2020	420 IPC	Mansa Devi Complex
2.	252	05.07.2021	420, 120-B IPC	Ambala City
3.	76	11.03.2022	406, 420, 506 IPC	Saha, District Ambala

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

“3. That the brief facts of the case are that the present case has been registered on the statement of the complainant Naseem Akhtar, who stated to the effect that;
(i) He works at the sound and light system at Ludhiana. Jaswinder Kumar Jassa is known to the complainant. Now he resides at Hampton Home, Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana. Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa told him that he had seen a property at Fatehgarh Sahih which belongs to the NRI party, and they would get the land at quite lower

rates. There could be a great profit in the same. Thereupon, the complainant disclosed about the same to his friend Prajal, who gave his consent to purchase the above said land.

(ii) Thereafter, they told Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa that they would purchase the land in half share each. They saw the land. They liked the land. They did not execute any agreement to sell of the above-mentioned land by believing Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa.

(iii) That the complainant further stated that on 12.04.2025, they (Nasem Akhtar & Prajal) arranged the amount of Rs. 45,00,000/- each and put them into two bags and went to Fatehgarh Sahib in the village Saddo Majra, where land was situated. The complainant stated that the said amount was raised on loan by his father, regarding which he could produce the record later on. Both of them had gone on their car, and Jaswinder Kumar came on his car, make Creta bearing registration no. PB10- HK-5588. When at about 02:30 pm, they reached at the spot, they saw that a car make i20 was already parked there. Two persons were present in the said car.

(iv) That the complainant further stated that when they reached there, as per the plan of Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa, Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa holded both the bags of cash and suddenly the car make XUV 500 bearing registration no. CH-01-AT-0575 came to the spot, which was being driven by an employee in uniform along with three more persons, On the front and back sides of the car, the sticker of police sticker was pasted, Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa sat in the car along with the bags, After threatening the complainant, Naseem Akhtar and his friend Prajal to kill them, they went away from the spot. Due to fear, they went back to their homes. Thereafter, they moved an application regarding the same and inquired about the matter at their own level and found that Jaswinder Kumar, along with 5-6 accomplices, had committed dacoity with them in pre Planed conspiracy.”

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 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 status report.

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

“4. That after the registration of FIR, the investigation was set into motion. During the investigation, on 08-05-2025, the complainant Naseem Akhtar recorded his supplementary statement to the effect that;

(i) In pursuance to the incident dated 12-04-2025 On 15-04-2025, at around 8:30 PM, some police officials came to their house. At that time, he (Naseem Akhtar) was not present at home, and the officials met his father. These persons had arrived in a car bearing registration number HR-01AF-0199 and had brought along Jaswinder Kumar@ Jassa out of these Persons Two persons were holding Jaswinder Kumar@ Jassa by his hands, and there were 5 people in total. They sat inside the shop, and among them, one ASI in uniform, namely Dharamveer Bangar (present petitioner), told the father of the complainant that they had come from the Crime Branch, Sector 26, Gurgaon (Haryana), and that they had arrested Jaswinder Kumar Jassa in respect to incident dated 12.04.2025. Thereupon, the father of the complainant told them that he had no knowledge of whether Jaswinder Kumar Jassa had been arrested or not as he was not properly cuffed and was only held by wrist by person who were not in uniform. Then the said alleged ASI told his father that they had caught Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa the date before yesterday at Fatehgarh Sahib, and that his son Naseem Akhtar (complainant) and his son's friend Prajal had gone with Jaswinder Kumar. The father of the petitioner stated that Rs. 90 lakhs had been misappropriated by them, and they should be asked where the money was. To this, the alleged ASI replied that nothing was recovered from Jaswinder Kumar. The alleged ASI further told his father that if he did not want his sons to be falsely implicated, then he must pay Rs. 15 lakhs by the next day, otherwise they would falsely arrest his sons in a fake counterfeit currency case.

(ii) That the complainant further stated that after issuing these threats, all those persons left. Before leaving, the said Bangar, gave his mobile number to his father, which was 82952-86116. Several conversations subsequently took place with Dharamveer Bangar (present petitioner), when he kept demanding money. Naseem Akhtar stated that he did not know whether Dharamveer Bangar was a genuine police officer or an impersonator. He further stated that he had inquired into the identities of the persons who were holding Jaswinder Kumar, and found them to be Vikas Kumar, son of Mohan Lal, resident of Kakrdu, Police Station Baldev Nagar, Ambala, and Vipin Kumar, son of Varinder Singh, resident of Manipur, Police Station Dogla, District Meerut, currently residing at Sultanpur, Jarota Road, Ambala. Regarding the driver who came with them, Naseem Akhtar stated that he could identify him if brought before him. The photo, wherein Dharamveer Bangar, was seen in police uniform demanding money from the father of the complainant is annexed herewith as Annexure R-1.”

8. Allegations against the petitioner are that he had threatened the complainant's father for falsely implicating his son for a case of counterfeit currency and had demanded Rs.15 lacs. He gave his phone number in which he continued to call for the extortion

amount. There is sufficient evidence involving the petitioner with the alleged offense. It is not a case for anticipatory bail.

9. The sly way the petitioner conned the complainant points out the dangerous trend of the revival of thuggee by revisiting the history.

10. 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 anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

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.