



\$~5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 203/2025**

PRAGAT SINGH MINHAS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.K.Thakur, Mr.Rishabh Kr.
Thakur, Mr. Shambhavi Thakur, Ms.
Priyambada and Ms. Anjali
Aggarwal, Advocates.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
with SI Sushil and ASI Ramesh Babu,
P.S.Jaitpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

21.02.2025

%

1. The Anticipatory Bail Application under Section 482 B.N.S.S has been filed on behalf of the Accused/**Pargat Singh Minhas** in FIR No.283/2024 under Sections 186/353/332/323/341/506/34 IPC, registered at P.S. Jaitpur.
2. It is submitted that the Anticipatory Bail Application filed before the learned ASJ, Delhi has been dismissed on 19.07.2024. The co-accused persons, namely Komal Preet Kaur, Ranu Kaur, and Amandeep Singh, have already been granted Anticipatory Bail by the learned ASJ on 12.08.2024. Regular Bail has been granted to co-accused/Sarabjeet Kaur on 24.08.2024.
3. The Applicant is a law abiding citizen who has been falsely implicated in this case. There is a property dispute between Rahul Kumar and co-accused Sarabjeet Kaur. On the complaint of Rahul Kumar FIR No.270/2024 dated 14.06.2024 under Section 448/506 IPC was registered against the parents of the Applicant. Police issued a notice under Section 41-



A to the co-accused Sarabjeet Kaur and her husband Harbans to join the investigations. Co-accused Sarabjeet Kaur did not join the investigations and NBWs were issued against her on 24.06.2024.

4. On 25.06.2024 at about 6.30 AM some police persons in civil uniform without disclosing their identity came to the house of Sarabjeet Kaur to arrest her. Relatives and neighbours thought that Rahul Kumar had sent some Goondas to grab the property and abduct Sarabjeet Kaur.

5. It is submitted that when the police had gone to execute the NBW against co-accused Sarabjeet Kaur and Harbans at House No.152, Village Jaitpur, Delhi the Applicant along with the other co-accused persons obstructed the police party as their identity was not disclosed as they were in civil uniform.

6. It is submitted that according to the case of the State, the co-accused Gagandeep Kaur had bitten on the arm of the lady Police Constable who was in civil uniform with the muffled face and had come to arrest her mother, Mrs. Sarabjeet Kaur. The photograph showing police personnel dressed as civilians is annexed with the Bail Application.

7. In the meantime, the persons in civil uniform informed Police Station and at 7.30 AM few policemen in uniform came to the house of Sarabjeet Kaur and arrested her. Thereafter, present FIR No.283/2024 against eight persons, for obstructing the police in performing their duty, was registered. It is claimed that this FIR is an example of nexus between the land mafia and the police, and has been registered at the instance and in connivance with Mr. Rahul Kumar to browbeat and harass them with an ulterior motive to pressurise co-accused/Sarabjeet Kaur to settle the property dispute with Mr. Rahul Kumar.



8. It is claimed that the FIR lodged against the Applicant is a gross abuse of the process of law. The allegations made in the FIR are absurd, preposterous and an outcome of land grabber.

9. The Bail is sought on the ground that no offence as per the allegations made in the complaint on which FIR No.283/2024 has been registered is made out. It is further submitted that four co-accused have already been granted Anticipatory Bail, while Sarabjeet Kaur has been granted regular bail on 19.07.2024. He has not been named in the FIR. Reliance has been placed on Sushila Aggarwala & Ors vs. State of NCT of Delhi, (2020) 5 SCC 1 and P.Chidambaram vs. CBI, 2020 13 SCC 337 to seek Anticipatory Bail.

10. The Status Report has been filed on behalf of the State and the Bail Application has been opposed on the ground that he has not appeared to join the investigations and NBWs have been issued against him after which the proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C has been commenced against him. It is submitted that the grant of Anticipatory Bail would certainly hamper the investigation and increase tension in the local society, therefore, the bail is opposed.

11. **Submissions heard and record perused.**

12. There is essentially no custodial interrogation which is sought to be made. The four co-accused persons, with similar allegations, have already been admitted to Anticipatory Bail.

13. Considering the totality of the circumstances, it is directed that in the event of his arrest, the Petitioner shall be admitted to Anticipatory Bail by the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The Petitioner shall furnish a personal bond in the sum of



Rs.20,000/-with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer.

- (ii) The Petitioner shall join the investigations, as and when called by the Investigating Officer.
 - (iii) The Petitioner shall furnish his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer on which he may be contacted at any time and shall ensure that the number is kept active and switched-on at all times.
 - (iv) The petitioner shall not contact, nor visit, nor offer any inducement, threat or promise to any of the prosecution witnesses or other persons acquainted with the facts of case.
 - (v) The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that is unlawful or that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial.
14. The Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.
15. Copy of the Order be sent to the learned Trial Court for compliance.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

FEBRUARY 21, 2025

rk