



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-21207-2026
Decided on : 24.04.2026

Ritik Chauhan . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ritik Chauhan	150	06.04.2024	S. 365, 34 of IPC [S. 137, 3(5) of BNS, 2023] [S. 148, 149, 364-A, 386, 452, 120-B of IPC, added later on] [S. 191(2), 190, 140, 308(2), 331(1), 61 of BNS, 2023] and 25 of Arms Act, 1959	Pinjore	Panchkula

2. In succinctly, the brief facts of the case are as under:-

“ Incident took place on 06.04.2024, at about 9:30 PM, when the complainant – Rishi Pal was taking meal at his home. As per the allegations, 7/8 boys entered the house and by showing pistol-like weapons, sticks and rods, kidnapped him from there and forcibly put him inside a Mahindra XUV-500 car bearing registration No. HR26-CD-1731 of silver colour. At the time of occurrence, Manjit Kaur and Ashok Kumar were also sitting there. It is further alleged that the accused had reached the house of the complainant in three vehicles



— the aforesaid XUV-500, a Swift (black colour) and a Verna (white colour). After kidnapping the complainant, they proceeded towards Panchkula-Zirakpur Highway. Thereafter, the complainant was taken to some deserted place, where the accused persons started demanding money from him. It is also mentioned in the FIR that while the complainant was being kidnapped, the accused persons were calling each other by their names and therefore the complainant came to know of two names, namely, Anmol and Ankit. Subsequently, Manjit Kaur was called upon by the accused persons and ransom amount of ₹25,00,000/- was demanded from her, if she wanted to see the complainant alive. Later on, after about 2½ hours, the complainant was dropped near Sector-21, Tau Devi Lal Stadium, Panchkula, after receipt of the ransom amount.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as neither he is named in the FIR, nor any role has been attributed to him by the complainant at any point of time, whether during the alleged kidnapping, demand of ransom, movement in vehicles, or release of the victim Rishi Pal.

It is submitted that the role of the petitioner has surfaced only through the disclosure statements of the co-accused.

4. Learned counsel further submits that in the absence of any overt act, physical presence, telephonic link, or recovery of any kind, no material exists to show that the petitioner had any role in the alleged kidnapping or demand of ransom.

It is further submitted that co-accused, namely (i) Arun Baniwal @ Arun @ Jagira, (ii) Ankit Giri, (iii) Akash, (iv) Darshan Singh @ Vicky, (v) Kunal, and (vi) Naveen Kumar @ Naveen, have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 20.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-30815-2025 & connected case (Annexure P-2) and dated



06.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-67766-2025 & connected cases (Annexure P-3).

According to learned counsel, the case of the petitioner stands on similar footing with the aforesaid co-accused.

5. It is also submitted that the petitioner is inside the jail for a period of more than 01 year and 11 months and a substantial number of prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Accordingly, on the ground of parity and in view of the aforesaid circumstances, prayer has been made for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 22.04.2026 in Court today. The same is taken on record. Office is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the allegations in the present case are serious in nature, involving offences under Sections 364-A and 386 IPC, which carry severe punishment. It is submitted that the complainant was forcibly kidnapped at gunpoint and thereafter ransom of Rs.25,00,000/- was extorted before his release, which reflects pre-planning and organized execution involving a group of armed persons.

It is further submitted that since the trial is underway, no ground is made out for grant of regular bail and there is apprehension of tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses.

However, learned State counsel fairly concedes the other factual submissions noticed here-above.



8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance, this Court finds that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and no specific role has been attributed to him by the complainant in relation to the alleged kidnapping, demand of ransom, movement of vehicles, or release of the victim.

The implication of the petitioner is stated to have surfaced subsequently during investigation primarily on the basis of disclosure statements of the co-accused. The evidentiary value of such material and the precise extent of involvement of the petitioner are matters to be examined by the learned trial Court during the course of trial.

It has further been brought to the notice of this Court that several co-accused, namely Arun Baniwal @ Arun @ Jagira, Ankit Giri, Akash, Darshan Singh @ Vicky, Kunal and Naveen Kumar @ Naveen, have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. Though parity is not to be applied mechanically, yet the said circumstance is also a relevant factor for consideration at this stage.

It is also not disputed that the petitioner is inside the jail for a period of more than 01 year and 11 months. A substantial number of prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and, therefore, the conclusion of trial is likely to take some time.

So far as the apprehension expressed by learned State counsel regarding tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses is concerned, the same can be adequately taken care of by imposing appropriate conditions.

9. Keeping in view the fact that petitioner was not named in the FIR; no specific overt act has been attributed to him; period of custody



already undergone; stage of trial; and the principle of parity, this Court is of the considered opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 24, 2026

J.Ram

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>