



256

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

CRM-M-66934-2025

Date of decision : 04.12.2025

Dalbir @ Dhillu**....Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana****.... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Simranjeet Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Simranjeet Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Yuvraj Singh Angira, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.06 dated 06.01.2025, under Sections 182, 195, 186, 199, 200, 211, 384, 500 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Jhajjar, District Jhajjar, Haryana.

2. As per the facts of the case, On a complaint under Section 175(3) of BNSS (Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C.), the present FIR was lodged. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 29.06.2025. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jhajjar, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 13.08.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case.



He submits that the complainant had lodged an FIR on the basis of exaggerated allegations. From the bare reading of the allegations, he argued that it is an admitted fact that the petitioner was employee of co-accused, namely, Anuraj. He submits that the precise dispute is between the complainant and Anuraj, who is at large. He submits that the petitioner has been roped in the present case being her employee. He submits that out of the 06 accused, other 05 co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. It is submitted that challan already stands presented. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant, however, has vehemently opposed the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner. He submits that petitioner is not only simplicitor named in FIR, but also has played an active role. He submits that in conspiracy with the co-accused, the petitioner was blackmailing the complainant. He submits that main accused Anuraj is already at large and she could not be arrested so far and thus, granting bail to the petitioner, at this stage, would adversely affect the on going trial.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that co-accused Anuraj had been filing the bogus complaints to extort money and one of the FIR i.e. FIR No.47 dated 08.05.2023 registered at Police Station Mahila Jhajjar, which was registered by Anuraj, had already been cancelled and till date she could not be arrested. She submits that in all there are 10 accused out of which 05 co-accused are already on anticipatory bail. She has produced on record the custody certificate of the



petitioner. She submits that investigation is complete and challan has been filed.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 29.06.2025. The petitioner was employed with co-accused Anuraj. Admittedly, 05 of the co-accused, have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. Investigation is complete and challan is already presented. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 05 months and 01 days as on 03.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.12.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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