

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

113

2026.PHHC.034818



CRM-M-67047-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.03.2026.

MOHD KAIF

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Armaan Dahiya, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.147 dated 16.04.2025, under Section(s) 308(5), 310(2) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Bhondsi, Gurugram.

2. Status report already filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record.

3. Succinctly, facts of the case are:

“Complainant Dharambir Verma who is a motivational speaker and involved in social work, on 17th March 2025 went to Hotel King Inn, Sector 17, Gurugram, where he talked to one Lali

over the phone, whom he had met in a club in Gurugram. Lali told him to reach Hero Honda Chowk Gurugram around 11:00 p.m. where Lali along with his brother was waiting on a bullet bike. She urged him that there is a Mall nearby where they can sit and talk and his brother can also eat something. He also had to go back, so he kept cab with him. They reached Averia Mall immediately. She said that the mall is closed and asked to go somewhere nearby to eat. He left the cab there and they made him sit with them on the bike. After that they went to the petrol pump near Dhamroj Toll. The boy went to the pump saying that they need to fill petrol in the bike and came back and said that they are not getting petrol. There was a white car near the pump. The girl (Lali) said that he knows him and will drop. them back at the mall. He sat in the car with the girl. After going further, they stopped the car and suddenly two people came. The girl got down from one side. Suddenly two people showed him a pistol and asked him to sit quietly. After that, they drove the car very fast and took him somewhere for about 2 hours. They kept him in the car overnight and they kept beating him. Then they demanded one crore rupees from him and also took his neck chain (gold) and a ring. At around 7:00 in the morning, they called his family and friends from his phone and asked them to tell them that the car has met with an accident and send him money. By doing this, they took about 6 lakh rupees without the knowledge of his family. When he promised them that he would not complain, they landed him a little before Dhamroj Toll at around 2:00 pm. Accordingly, the aforesaid FIR was registered.”

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the aforesaid case. He contends that the incident in question is stated to have taken place on 17th/18th March 2025, however, the complaint was submitted to the police one month after the incident and thus the FIR has been registered after a period of one

month. He contends that as per the contents of the FIR itself, complainant went to Thailand after the incident and thereafter he got the present FIR registered. It is contended that the investigation reflects that certain amount was transferred from the complainant's account to different bank accounts, however, none of the account belongs to the petitioner. He contends that the petitioner has clean antecedents and is in custody since 22.04.2025 and thus has undergone an actual custody for a period of nearly 10 months. He further contends that neither any link of the petitioner to the alleged incident has been established nor is he stated to have availed any benefit. He contends that a car of the uncle of the petitioner has been recovered from the petitioner but the same would not establish that petitioner has made any extortion call or has retained any of the articles belonging to the complainant.

5. State counsel, on the other hand, is not in a position to dispute the facts as aforesaid. He reiterates that the petitioner played an active role in the commission of the crime and that he along with other co-accused had abducted the complainant in the car and carried out the crime in which the complainant was made to pay a sum of Rs.4 lakhs and his gold ring was also taken away. He, however, does not dispute that when the petitioner sat in the car, it was not on account of abduction, rather the complainant voluntarily sat in the said car with the complainant. He also does not dispute that no recovery of any money or the alleged articles has been effected from the petitioner.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts as noticed above, the clean antecedents of the petitioner, his young age of 22 years and stage of the trial where no witness out of 22 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present

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

7. 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.

8. 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.

March 07, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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