



CRM-M-54786-2025

-1-

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

236

CRM-M-54786-2025

Date of decision: 8th December, 2025

Manish Dhayal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sunil Goswami, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

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 309(4), 310(2), 311, 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25(1-B)(a) and 27(1) (added later on) 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 Vijendra



Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma with him to Gurugram. He told him that some acquaintance of the above named Vijendra Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma would meet them thereto 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 Vijendra 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, Vijendra Bhandari had called his relative Manish i.e. petitioner, who came along with one Manjit. The petitioner 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 the petitioner standing with some unknown persons. On asking of the petitioner and co-accused Vijendra Bhandari, the complainant took cash amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- and while he was giving the same to Vijendra Bhandari, one youth came from the back side and he pointed a pistol towards Vijendra Bhandari and Rajesh Sharma and snatched the polythene containing money. Even the petitioner and his companion Manjit joined them. Some money fell down. The petitioner 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 petitioner and co-accused Rohit Huda were arrested on 28.01.2025. They suffered disclosure statements and admitted their involvement in the subject crime. They also disclosed the name of the their accomplice as Mandeep @ Deepu. He 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.

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 28.01.2025. A false recovery has been planted upon him. 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. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, an amount of Rs. 79,500/- (excluding some amount of money) had been looted from the complainant on 23.01.2025. The petitioner has been in custody since 28.01.2025. Challan has since been presented. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, that 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

8th December, 2025
Parveen Sharma

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