



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

220

CRM-M-27708-2026
Date of decision: 21.05.2026

RAJU @ RAJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Sourabh Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arjun Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 209 dated 17.11.2025, registered under Section(s) 115, 190, 191(2), 308(4), 324(4) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 115(2), 310(2), 324(3), 324(5), 324(6), 61(2), 238(b) of BNS, 2023 were added and Section 115, 190, 191(2) of BNS, 2023 were deleted later on) at Police Station Nangal Chaudhri, District Mahendergarh.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 16.11.2025 at about 8:00 P.M., two Bolero vehicles, without registration number plates, arrived at Sirohi Bihali Toll Plaza from the side of Nangal Chaudhary. It is alleged that approximately 14 to 15 young persons alighted from the said

vehicles and thereafter vandalized the toll plaza infrastructure, including the boom barriers, UPS system, LED screens and CCTV cameras, thereby causing damage assessed at approximately Rs.20–25 lakhs. It is further the case of the prosecution that the aforesaid persons also permitted several vehicles to pass through the toll plaza without payment of toll charges, resulting in an additional alleged loss of nearly Rs.10 lakhs to the toll management authorities. The prosecution further alleges that while leaving the spot, the said persons threatened the toll plaza staff by stating that if the toll plaza was to continue functioning, payment would have to be made to them.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR was registered after an unexplained delay of more than 24 hours from the occurrence. It is further submitted that the CCTV footage pertaining to the incident had already been taken into possession by the investigating agency and, therefore, the prosecution case is substantially founded upon electronic evidence. Learned counsel further submits that the identification of the other assailants itself remains doubtful and suspect and, in the absence of any cogent material linking the petitioner with the occurrence, there is nothing on record to prima facie connect the petitioner with the commission of the alleged offence. It is additionally contended that the matter now stands amicably resolved between the parties.

4. Learned State Counsel on the other hands submits that the petitioner has criminal antecedents and four other cases have been registered against the petitioner out of which 02 cases under the MMDR Act, while 01 case is of rash and negligent driving and 01 case has been registered under

Section 174-A of the IPC.

5. Mr. Arjun Singh, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent No.2-Complainant and files his power of attorney in the Court today which is taken on record. He does not dispute the settlement and contends that there is no subsisting grievance.

6. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody of more than 06 months already undergone by the petitioner coupled with the circumstance that investigation qua the petitioner stands completed, and further taking into account that the dispute between the parties has since been amicably resolved, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MAY 21, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No