

2025:PHHC:091570



102

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

**CRM-M-36390-2025
DECIDED ON: 24.07.2025**

RINKU CHAUHAN

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate with
Ms. Swati Katoch, Advocate and
Mr. Rajender Kumar, 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. 393 dated 03.07.2025 under Sections 4(1), 3 and 7 of the Haryana Prevention of Public Gambling Act, 2025 registered at Police Station Gharaunda, Karnal, Haryana.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the petitioner was not present at the time of the alleged raid and has been arrayed as an accused solely on the basis of his Call Detail Records (CDR), which indicate that he was in regular

contact with co-accused Vijay Sharma, who is named in the FIR. Beyond this, no other incriminating material has surfaced to establish the petitioner's involvement in the commission of the alleged offence. It is further submitted that there are no direct allegations of entrustment of money to the petitioner. Counsel further undertakes that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation and shall join the same as and when required.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. AG. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He strongly opposes the prayer made in the present petition, contending that the petitioner is allegedly involved in operating a syndicate of organized gambling in collusion with the main accused, Vijay Sharma. It is further submitted that, as per the Call Detail Records (CDR) of the petitioner's mobile phone, it is evident that he was in constant contact with accused Vijay Sharma, thereby indicating his active participation in the commission of the alleged offence.

3. **Analysis**

During the course of today's hearing, Mr. Aman Pal addressed the submissions made by the State, specifically referring to the alleged communication and transaction receipts between the main accused Vijay and the present petitioner. These documents purportedly reflect certain monetary transactions amounting to Rs. 10,000/-, which as submitted by the petitioner's counsel are connected to medical bills and other records of Prabhu Multispeciality Hospital and Trauma Center, a facility owned by the petitioner which is duly supported by receipts and bills from the medical store related to the payment.

In the light of above, since the facts at this stage are disputed. 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.

4. **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 the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. 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

24.07.2025
Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No
Whether reportable :Yes/No