

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

2025:PHHC:163984



(240)

CRM-M-65283-2025

Date of decision: 26.11.2025

Date of uploading: 26.11.2025

Sagar @ Ankit

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS 2023 on behalf of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.319 dated 11.08.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 3(5), 308(5), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 111(3) and 61 of BNS 2023 added later on) at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out by the petitioner in the present petition) is as follows:-

“To The SHO Sahib, Police Station Taraori. Sir, It is requested that I am Arvind Kumar son of Devraj resident of Laxmi Colony, Taraori. I have small property business. On dated 04.08.2024, I received a whatsapp call 0 my phone No.9034051421, No.351969711728 at 2:21 in which a person introduced himself as Bhanu Rana and asked me to give him

Rs.50 lakh protection money (Ransom) within 2 days otherwise I will get you and your family shot dead. I tried to dissuade him but he again threatened to get me and my family killed. I tried to dissuade him but he again threatened to get me and my family killed. Since that day I am continuously receiving calls on my number from the same number and Bhanu Rana is talking about killing me and asking me to give him ransom money. I answered his call. I have made the recording from another phone and have attached that recording with this application. Sir, I suspect that two persons named Rajinder Rana (9996126063) and his son Abhey Rana are also involved in this heinous matter because one and a half months ago I saw Abhay Rana roaming around my office in a suspicious condition and I have also attached the footage of some other persons around my house which is recorded by my house CAMERA and I have also attached that with my application and Rajinder Rana and Abhay Rana father and son, had threatened me regarding an earlier deal that they would see me. You are requested to take strictest action on my application. Sd/- Arvind Kumar”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2024. Learned counsel has iterated that the co-accused namely Rajinder Singh, who is similarly situated as the petitioner (herein) has been extended the concession of regular bail vide order dated 28.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-63103-2024 (Annexure P-3). Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail.

Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 25.11.2025 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 14.08.2024 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan was presented on 13.11.2024. Total 25 prosecution witness have been cited, out of which none has been examined till date. It is not in dispute that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. As per custody certificate dated 25.11.2025 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 5 months and 15 days. Further, as per the said custody certificate the petitioner is stated to be involved in 05 more cases. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of

Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477 & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

Suffice to say, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of the above, the petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed

hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

26.11.2025
Naveen

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