

CRM-M-65586-2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-65586-2024
Reserved on: 14.02.2025
Pronounced on: 19.02.2025

Sujal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kamil Nagpal, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
425	04.12.2024	City Ferozepur, District Ferozepur	333, 140(3), 324(4), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS 2023

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. In paragraph 13 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“..... it is most respectfully submitted that FIR No. 425 dated 04.12.2024, U/s 333, 140(3), 324(4), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, Police Station City Ferozepur has been registered against Enjoy son of Baldev Raj, Sujal (present petitioner), Jatin son of not known and two unknown persons on the statement of Payal wife of Enjoy (accused) on the allegations that on 01.12.2024, at 12:00 night, when she along with her parents and minor child of about 3 years were sleeping at their house, Enjoy armed with kirpan, Sujal (present petitioner) armed with Axe, Jatin armed with kappa and two unknown persons trespassed into the house and started damaging

CRM-M-65586-2024

the household articles and after breaking open the main door of the house, entered in the house and took away the minor child. While leaving the house, they also damaged the Acura and car.”

4. The petitioner's counsel submits that co-accused/Enjoy has been granted bail by Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, vide order dated 09.01.2025. He further prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply. Complainant's counsel vehemently opposes the bail.

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

“That so far as the role of the petitioner is concerned, he is member of unlawful assembly and he along with co-accused Enjoy and Jatin and two unknown persons have trespassed the house of the complainant trespassed into the house of complainant and damaged the household articles and after breaking open the main door of the house, entered in the house and took away the minor child and further while leaving the house, they also damaged the Acura and car. Thus the petitioner has committed heinous crime.”

REASONING:

7. Perusal of the file shows that it is a family dispute and the petitioner is implicated in the present case for accompanying his friend and the fact that co-accused/Enjoy, who is main accused, whose wife has filed the present FIR, has been granted bail, petitioner is also entitled to bail on parity.

8. 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-trial incarceration.

9. 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.

10. The investigation indicates that the petitioner is not the main accused, so the petitioner's bail shall not be treated as a precedent for granting bail to the other co-

CRM-M-65586-2024

accused with a higher role.

11. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

CONDITIONS:

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

13. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner 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)	

14. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner 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.

15. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and 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. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

16. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner 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 (Crl.) 458); and Aparna

CRM-M-65586-2024

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

17. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

18. It is clarified that if the petitioner 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 petitioner moves for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

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

20. The concerned trial court is authorized to delete, modify, or relax any of the above conditions and shall be competent to do so in accordance with the law.

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

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

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

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

19.02.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.