

CRM-M-63103-2024

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

CRM-M-63103-2024
Reserved on: 18.02.2025
Pronounced on: 28.02.2025

Rajinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen K. Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
319	11.08.2024	Taraori, District Karnal	3(5), 308(5), 351(2) of BNS (Sections 61, 111(3) of BNS added later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above came before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. In paragraph 13 of the bail petition, the accused declares the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	324	2024	111(2)(B), 111(5), 287, 308(4) of BNS 2023 and 25 of Arms Act	Karnal Civil Lines, Karnal

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“Statement of complainant:-

I have small property business on date 4.8.24 I received a WHATSAPP CALL my on phone no. 9034051421, mobile no.351969711728 at 2:21 in which a person introduced himself as Bhanu Rana and asked me to give him Rs.50 lakh protection money ransom within 2 days otherwise, I will get you and your family shot dead. I tried to dissuade him but he again

CRM-M-63103-2024

threatened to get me and my family killed. Since that day I continuously receiving calls on my number from the same number and Bhanu Rana is talking about killing me and asking me to give him ransom money.

I have made the recording from another phone and have attached that recording with this application and I suspect that two persons named Rajinder Rana 99961xxxxx and his son Abhay Rana are also involved in this heinous matter because one and a half months ago I saw Abhay Rana roaming around my office in a suspicious condition and I have also attached the footage of some other persons around my house which is recorded by my house's CAMERA and I have also attached that with my application and Rajinder Rana and Abhay Rana and father threatened me regarding an they would see me. son had earlier deal that they would see me.”

4. The petitioner's counsel seeks bail on parity with co-accused Joginder alias Joga Singh , Geeta and Jaideep, who were granted bail by Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal fide orders dated 28.11.2024, 03.12.2024 and 08.01.2025 respectively. He further prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State’s counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“That as per investigation the accused Bhanu Rana and Abhay Rana extended the threats to the complainant to give Rs. 50 Lakhs as protection money. Towards protection money.

13. That as per the investigation present petitioner/accused is the father of Abhay Rana and co-accused and the present petitioner remained in touch with each other.

14. That as per investigation there are serious allegations against the present petitioner/accused for involvement in making extortion calls and there is possibility of repeating similar offence. Thus the present petition deserves to be dismissed.”

REASONING:

7. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing.

8. As per the custody certificate dated 17.02.2025, the petitioner’s total custody in this FIR is 06 months & 02 days.

CRM-M-63103-2024

9. Given the fact that co-accused (as mentioned above) have been granted bail and the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

11. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

12. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

13. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

14. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to *Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2018 All SCR (CrI.) 458; and *Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

15. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the victim, and their family members, as well as the members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearm(s). [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond

CRM-M-63103-2024

reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from release from prison and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

16. Till the completion of the trial, the convict shall not contact, call, text, message, remark, stare, stalk, make any gestures or express any unusual or inappropriate, verbal or otherwise objectionable behavior towards the victim and victim's family, either physically or through phone call or any other social media, through any other mode, nor shall unnecessarily roam around the victim's home and workplace.

17. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

18. It is clarified that if the petitioner violates any bail condition, the State and/or the victim may file an application for bail cancellation before the trial court, which shall be competent to cancel the bail or add more conditions. Furthermore, if the petitioner moves for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

19. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State shall file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail.**

20. The concerned trial court is authorized to delete, modify, or relax any of the above conditions and shall be competent to do so in accordance with the law.

21. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

22. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the

CRM-M-63103-2024

official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

23. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

28.02.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.