

2026.PHHC.044923



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10487-2026

Monu
...Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	18.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 625 dated 16.09.2025 registered under Sections 115, 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNS’) (Sections 311, 190 and 191(3) of BNS added and Section 3(5) of BNS deleted later on) at Police Station Sadar

2026.PHHC.044923



Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Pardeep alleging that on the night of 14.02.2025, 4-5 youths followed his car in a Swift Maruti car, stopped his vehicle near Maruti company, had pulled him outside his vehicle, extended beatings to him, robbed him of his gold neck chain, cash amount of Rs. 50,000/- and his cell phone and then fled away while causing injury on his head with an iron rod. He somehow managed to go to hospital for his treatment. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. CCTV footage of the incident was obtained which showed the presence of the petitioner and his active participation in the occurrence. The accused Shiven and petitioner were joined into investigation on the basis of a secret information. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. The accused Shiven got recovered the vehicle used by him at the time of commission of the subject offence. He disclosed the name of one of their accomplices as Lokender @ Lucky. Offence under Section 311 of BNS was added. The above named Lokender was also arrested subsequently. The petitioner got recovered the mobile phone belonging to the complainant. Some other persons were also nominated as additional accused. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. A false recovery has been planted upon him. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His

2026.PHHC.044923



antecedents are clean. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. There are chances of his absconding, intimidating the witnesses or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in pursuance of common object thereof as well as in connivance with each other, he is alleged to have intercepted the complainant on the fateful day, assaulted him and robbed him of his belongings. A CCTV footage of the camera installed in the vicinity had been procured during investigation. A pen drive showing the incident has been placed on record and has been watched by his court on the official computer. The identity of the persons, who are assaulting the victim is clearly seen and as submitted by learned State counsel, the identity of the complainant has been fully established by the complainant. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The case at its initial stage since no prosecution witness has been examined. The contention that the petitioner may abscond or intimidate

2026.PHHC.044923



the complainwwant or other material witnesses cannot be considered to be unfounded at this stage. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

8. Since the main petition has already been decided, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

23rd March, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |