

CRM-M-58135-2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58135-2024
Reserved on: 15.01.2025
Pronounced on: 28.01.2025

Karambir and others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0114	13.04.2023	Khol, Rewari	148, 149, 323, 324, 506 IPC (Subsequently added Sections 326 & 201 IPC at the time of framing of charges)

1. The petitioners apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above came before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. In paragraph 23 of the bail petition, the accused declare that they have criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“3. That the facts forming the genesis of the present FIR are that on 12.04.2024 a written complaint was moved by the complainant wherein he had gone contending that on 12.04.2024 at about 06:30 p.m. when he was present at his plot, then the petitioners along with one Yash had come in a tractor loaded with chaff and unloaded the said chaff in front of the house of the complainant, to which Lata Devi objected due to she being an asthma patient. It was further asserted by the complainant that Asha, Sumitra and Saroj (petitioners herein) had started hurling filthy abuses at Lata Devi and then on hearing the noise, the complainant alongwith his

CRM-M-58135-2024

wife Poonam came out of his house and he also told the petitioners to unload the tractor in front of their own house, upon which the petitioners along with others accused in furtherance of their common intention came to the spot. The complainant further divulged that petitioner Karambir was carrying an axe while the remaining petitioners were carrying lathis and dandas in their respective hands. Petitioner Karambir gave an axe blow on the head of the complainant and he also gave another axe blow on the fingers of the left hand of the complainant. It was further contended by the complainant that thereafter other petitioners and one Yash had given him kick and slap blows. The wife of the sister-in-law of the complainant tried to rescue the complainant, they were also given beatings by the petitioners. On raising noise, they were rescued by Saroj wife of Narender and Manbir son of Jagan Lal and while going away, the petitioners and other co-accused had extended them a threat to kill. Legal action was sought. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the FIR aforementioned was registered and the investigations in the matter were taken up.”

4. The petitioners’ counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioners and their family.

5. The State’s counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“12. That as per investigation, the petitioners acting in pursuance of their intention, had opened an assault on the complainant party. The occurrence was duly recorded in the CCTV footage. Every petitioner was found present in the footage. The allegations are serious in nature. However, it is submitted that concededly the police does not require the custody of the petitioners as the investigation of the case had already been completed. The arrest of the petitioners is not contemplated by the police as no such directions have been issued by any competent court of law to rearrest the petitioners or with regards to the cancellation of bail, granted to them. Concededly, the complicity of the petitioners had not been found in any other criminal case.”

7. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-

CRM-M-58135-2024

trial incarceration.

8. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioners make a case for bail.

9. Given above, provided the petitioners are not required in any other case, the petitioners shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

10. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioners shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

11. The petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioners shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

12. The petitioners shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

13. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioners shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to *Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2018 All SCR (CrI.) 458; and *Aparna*

CRM-M-58135-2024

Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

14. Given the background of allegations against the petitioners, it becomes paramount to protect the victim, and their family members, as well as the members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearm(s). [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioners shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from release from prison and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioners shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

15. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

16. It is clarified that if the petitioners violates any bail condition, the State and/or the victim may file an application for bail cancellation before the trial court, which shall be competent to cancel the bail or add more conditions. Furthermore, if the petitioners move for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

17. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioners indulge in any non-bailable offense, the State shall file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail.**

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

19. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioners can download this order along with case status from the

CRM-M-58135-2024

official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

20. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

28.01.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.