



CRM-M-66302-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-66302-2025

Date of Decision: 12.12.2025

Parveen Bidhuri

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate and
Mr. Prikshit Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Nishant Indal, Advocate for
Mr. Anil Mehta, Advocate, for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.232 dated 30.05.2023, registered under Sections 379-B, 365, 285 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 302, 201, 120-B, 364 IPC added lateron), at Police Station Faridabad Central, District Faridabad.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Bansi Lal son of Shobha Ram. It was alleged that the complainant was employed by Nagendra Chaudhary as a driver. On 30.05.2023, at about 10:00 A.M., the complainant took his employer, namely, Nagendra Chaudhary (deceased) from his village Mohala in the Fortuner Car to Sector 15 Faridabad. At about 10:30 A.M., when they reached Sector 15, Faridabad, his employer, Nagendra Chaudhary asked the complainant to park the Fortuner car in the shade and thus, he did the same. It was alleged that when both of them were sitting in the car, a person came from behind in a black Scorpio car, who looked like one Pankaj Chauhan. As soon as he came, he opened the front



CRM-M-66302-2025

-2-

window from the conductor side and started abusing his employer, Nagendra Chaudhary. Thereafter, he fired gun shot in the air. It was alleged that being afraid, the complainant left the car and started running. He heard sound of 2-3 more fire arm shots. It was alleged that this person, after beating, kidnapped Nagendra Chaudhary in his Fortuner car. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, dead body of Nagendra Chaudhary was recovered by the police on 05.06.2023 from Nainital, Uttarakhand. On 06.06.2023, the stolen car was seen crossing Toll Plaza on CCTV. The investigating agency arrested the co-accused, namely, Pankaj Chauhan on 22.06.2023. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Pankaj Chauhan, wherein it was disclosed that the petitioner had carried out the *recce* for kidnapping Nagendra Chaudhary. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 26.12.2023. The Investigating Agency, on completion of investigation, filed the challan and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 07.05.2024. Earlier also the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-31490-2024, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 05.12.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for the grant of regular bail.



3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner was cited as a prosecution witness PW-6 and it is hereinafter in a clandestine manner, he had been arrayed as accused in the present case. He submits that the petitioner himself got recovered two mobile phones of the main accused Pankaj Chauhan and same were deposited with the Investigating Agency as is evident from the recorded dated 23.06.2023. He submits that the petitioner resides in the vicinity of the place of occurrence and it is because of this, he has been implicated in the present case. He submits that the Investigating Agency itself has taken the petitioner to Nainital and thus, allegation against him that he visited Nainital, is without any basis. He submits that similarly situated co-accused Rahul @ Rahul Chaprana, against whom there were allegations of *recce*, has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 13.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-18595-2025. He submits that the petitioner has never been involved in any criminal case of the similar nature, though he has been prosecuted in the complaints under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, as he is a car dealer. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner in conspiracy with the co-accused has committed the offence. He submits that the petitioner is the instrumental in kidnapping and murdering Nagendra Chaudhary with in connivance with the co-accused. He, thus, has submitted that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of



CRM-M-66302-2025

-4-

bail.

5. Learned State counsel has also vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has filed the status report by way of affidavit of Rajeev Kumar, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Central, Faridabad and has submitted that the petitioner alongwith co-accused Pankaj Chauhan followed the car of the deceased from 28.05.2023 to 30.05.2023 in their vehicle No.HR-20-N-0003, which is evident from the CCTV footage recovered. It is submitted that complicity of the petitioner is proved from the call detail records. It is also submitted that the car of the petitioner was also recovered from Nainital. On instructions, he submits that out of total 61 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses have been examined so far. He submits that case of the co-accused who has been granted bail by this Court, is distinguishable from that of the petitioner. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that initially the petitioner was cited as prosecution witness, however, he was arrayed as accused in the present case in December, 2023 and thereafter, he was arrested on 26.12.2023. From the perusal of the status report, it is found that complicity of the petitioner is for the offence under Section 120-B IPC. Main accused is already behind bars. One co-accused Rahul @ Rahul Chaprana has already been granted bail by this Court. As submitted before this Court, out of total 61 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses have been examined. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 11 months & 15 days as on 11.12.2025. It further shows that the petitioner is not involved in any other



CRM-M-66302-2025

-5-

criminal case of similar nature, however, he has been prosecuted in six other complaints under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

12.12.2025
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No