



CRM-M-43652-2025

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

CRM-M-43652-2025

Reserved on: 19th August, 2025Pronounced on: 27th August, 2025

Mandeep @ Deepu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. B.S. Mamli, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 51 dated 24.01.2025 registered under Sections 310(2), 311, 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25(1-B)(a) and 27(1) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sadar Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. As per the allegations, on the night of 23.01.2025, on receipt of information about an incident of dacoity having taken place, a police party reached at the spot, where the complainant Sahil Madaan submitted a written complaint, alleging that on the same day, his brother-in-law Sanjiv had given cash amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- to him and had instructed him to take



CRM-M-43652-2025

Bijender Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma with him to Gurugram. He told him that some acquaintance of the above named Bijender Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma would meet them there to show some land, and advised the complainant to give the aforementioned amount as earnest money, if the said land was to his liking. The complainant along with the above named Bijender Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma and one Ravinder had left Panipat in his swift desire car. The aforementioned amount of money was kept in the boot of the car. After reaching Gurugram, Bijender Bhandari had called his relative Manish, who came along with one Manjit. Manish left the place after some time and told the complainant and others to reach the service lane near Rajiv Chowk Area. On reaching there, the complainant found Manish standing with some unknown persons. On asking of Manish and Bijender Bhandari, the complainant took cash amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- and while he was giving the same to Bijender Bhandari, one youth came from the back side and he pointed a pistol towards Bijender Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma and snatched the polythene containing money. Even Manish and his companion Manjit joined them. Some money fell down. Manish and his accomplices snatched the remaining money and fled from the spot. On his complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered.

3. As per the further allegations, the accused Manish and Rohit Huda were arrested. They suffered disclosure statements and admitted their involvement in the subject crime. They also disclosed the name of the their accomplice as Mandeep @ Deepu i.e. the present petitioner. The petitioner was arrested on 09.02.2025. A sum of Rs. 5,000/- out of the looted amount was recovered from him. Investigation now stands completed.



CRM-M-43652-2025

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He is in custody since 09.02.2025. A false recovery has been planted upon him. In fact, he had inimical relations with the co-accused Manjit and Manish and has been falsely implicated by them. A compromise has been effected between the complainant and the petitioner. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. *Per contra*, it is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, has submitted that he has no objection, if the petition is allowed, since the complainant has not identified the petitioner as the person, who had looted money from him. He has also sworn affidavit Annexure P-2 in this regard.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- (excluding some amount of money) had been looted from the complainant on 23.01.2025. The petitioner has been in custody since 09.02.2025. Challan has since been presented. Though no relevance can be given to the contents of the affidavit Annexure P-2, which has been filed by the petitioner and which is stated to have been sworn by the complainant in his favour,



CRM-M-43652-2025

however, keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 09.02.2025, the trial will take time to conclude and his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case is made out for release of the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail, subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds by two sureties to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to the condition that he will not try to make any contact whatsoever with the complainant and other material witnesses and extend any threat to them and will also not visit in the vicinity of the complainant and the material witnesses, during the pendency of the trial.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

27th August, 2025

Manju

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No