

2025:PHHC:085182



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

224

CRM-M-15995-2025  
Decided on:10.07.2025

**Ramavtar and another****...Petitioners****Versus****State of Haryana****...Respondent****Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj**

Present: Mr. Deepak Kaushik, Advocate, for  
Mr. S.K. Daaria, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.**

1. Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners during pendency of the trial in case FIR No.375 dated 04.11.2023, registered under Sections 379-A/34 IPC at Police Station Sector-5, Gurugram, District Gurugram.
2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the present FIR case was lodged on the basis of complaint made by Bimla Lamba who had alleged that on 04.11.2023, at around 09.10 am, when she was buying vegetables from the vegetable cart in front of her house, two unknown boys came on a black motorcycle with covered faces and started circled in front of her house. One of the boys got down from the motorcycle and came near the vegetable cart and on the pretext of asking address, he snatched chain from her neck and escaped along with the another boy on motorcycle. It was alleged that the incident has been captured in the CCTV camera installed in her house. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and during investigation, the complicity of the petitioners has been established in the commission of offence and, thus, they were arrested on 28.03.2024 in the present case, though they were in

2025:PHHC:085182



custody since 28.03.2024 in another FIR case. The petitioners approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Additional Sessions Judge declined the same vide order dated 03.03.2025. Hence, aggrieved by the said order, the petitioners are before this Court by of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present FIR case. It is submitted that the petitioners were arrested on 28.03.2024, however, identification of the petitioners have not been established. He further submitted that though the petitioners are involved in other cases, however, all cases are planted one and in most of the cases, the petitioners are either acquitted or on bail and, thus, they deserve to be enlarged on regular bail in the present FIR case as well.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners and drawn attention of this Court to the status report filed by way of affidavit of Sanjay Kumar, HPS, ACP, Old Gurugram. It is submitted that complicity of the petitioners has been established during investigation and that the incident has been captured in the CCTV footage obtained by the police during investigation. It is submitted that petitioner no.2 Raju has been seen assaulting the complainant-victim and, thereafter, he escaped along with petitioner no.1 Ramavtar from the scene of occurrence. He further submitted that arrest of petitioner no.2 Raju was effected on production warrants and petitioner no.1 Ramavtar got recovered Rs.16,000/-, whereas petitioner no.2 Raju got recovered Rs.24,000/-. Besides this, the petitioners are involved in multiple criminal cases and, thus, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the available record, it is deciphered that identity of the petitioners was established

2025:PHHC:085182



during investigation. Both the petitioners were arrested on 28.03.2024. The incident has been captured in CCTV footage. Perusal of the record would also show that the petitioners are involved in multiple criminal cases of the similar nature.

6. Keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners do not qualify for the grant of bail at this stage and hence, the present petition, being denuded of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

7. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**July 10, 2025**  
**vinod\***

**(Rajesh Bhardwaj)**  
**Judge**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: NO/YES  
Whether Reportable: NO/YES