



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-67087 of 2025

Date of Decision: 06.03.2026

Ravi alias Ravidas

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for bail is the first petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 180 dated 29.07.2025 for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 140(3), 309(2), 351(3), 61(2), 309(3), 309(6), 137(2) and 126(2) of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad, Haryana.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Mani Ram', hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was stated by the complainant that his daughter aged about 27 years, hereinafter being referred to as "victim" only, was a Teacher, and that on 29.07.2025 at about 02.30 .M.

when she was returning home in the school van, 'Sandeep', 'Ravi',

‘Mahender’ and two unknown persons, armed with wooden sticks, had intercepted the school van. According to complainant, after manhandling with the teachers and driver of the school van, they forcibly pulled the victim out of the school van and abducted her. According to complainant since then the whereabouts of his daughter was not known.

3. It is the case of prosecution that pursuant to the above-mentioned statement, the formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation when the victim was traced, her statement was recorded. In her statement, the victim stated that on 29.07.2025 at about 02.45 P.M. she was returning home in the school van, and that on the way their school van was stopped by some boys armed with sticks, who forcibly caught hold of her and pushed her in a black coloured car. According to victim when she tried to rescue herself, she was thrashed with slaps and punches, and was not allowed to leave the car. The abovesaid victim further stated that in the car she found that the assailants were ‘Sandeep’, a relative of the victim, ‘Ravi’ (the driver of the car) (the petitioner herein), ‘Narender’ and one more person. The victim further disclosed that she was abducted and forcibly taken away to a Farm House in Rajasthan, and that on 30.07.2025 at about 06.00 P.M. she was taken to Jaipur by ‘Sandeep’. According to victim on 31.07.2025 at about 07.00 A.M when ‘Sandeep’ was going to drop her at home they were traced by the police.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner

is innocent having no nexus, whatsoever, with the commission of crime. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, in fact the victim herself had accompanied the co-accused 'Sandeep' as she was in relationship with him, but later on by twisting the facts, the story of elopement has been converted into a story of abduction. With regard to role of the petitioner, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that as per prosecution story the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he was driving the car, which was used by the assailants.

7. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner is 18 years old boy, having no criminal antecedents, and that he has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than 6½ months. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, since nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, his detention in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has urged for the benefit of bail for the petitioner.

8. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. It has been contended by the learned State counsel that the petitioner was driver of the vehicle wherein the victim was abducted and therefore, his role is pivotal and quite prominent in the commission of crime. In addition to above, the learned State counsel has also contended that the facts of the case in itself show that a gruesome offence has been committed by the petitioner, and his co-accused, wherein a young girl has been abducted and taken away against her will to a far off place, for more than two days. The learned State counsel has further contended that the

statement of the prosecutrix/victim is yet to be recorded in the present case and therefore, at this stage, if the benefit of bail is afforded to the petitioner he may influence the witness.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A careful perusal of the record shows that in the present case, there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that he was a part of the group which had forcibly abducted the victim and took her away from Haryana to Rajasthan in a car. As per the case, set-out by the prosecution, the petitioner was the driver of above-mentioned car. In view of above, it is apparent that the petitioner had played an active and central role in the commission of above-mentioned offence.

11. In the present case, it is also relevant to mention here that the gravity of offence allegedly committed by the petitioner and his co-accused is very serious, in view of the fact that in broad daylight a school teacher was abducted from a school van, in the presence of other staff members of the school, and taken away. If the stand of the petitioner would have been true (that the victim was in active relationship with one of the co-accused), there could not have been a situation of forcible abduction of the victim. Thus, the plea taken by the petitioner cannot be accepted at this stage.

12. In the present case, another relevant aspect to be noted is that after recovery the victim has got her statement recorded by the police, wherein she implicated the petitioner & other accused. Thereafter, the statement of victim in the court is yet to be recorded.

13. Taking into consideration the entire scenario, since the period of incarceration of petitioner is not large enough to draw an inference that his

right of speedy trial is being violated, and otherwise the statement of victim is yet to be recorded, it is hereby held that at this stage, no ground for according the benefit of bail to the petitioner is made out, and the present petitioner, being devoid of merit, deserves dismissal. Hence, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

March 06, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No