

2025:PHHC:108481



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

**CRM-M No.3244 of 2025
Date of Decision: 20.08.2025
Reserved on: 11.08.2025**

Sumit ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jitender K. Sehrawat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
414	31.08.2024	Jind City, District Jind	115, 140(2), 140(3), 3(5), 304, 351(3) and 127 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (For short 'BNS')

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint submitted by the complainant Parteek Kumar alleging that he was a jeweller running his business under the name of M/s Parma

2025:PHHC:108481



Jewellers Private Limited at Jind. The accused Manoj was having business transactions with him for quite sometime due to which, the complainant had started trusting him. On 19.08.2024, the accused Manoj had come to him and had disclosed that he was going to receive money out of sale of his land and wanted to make investment of about 60-70 lakhs in the jewellery business. After alluring him with his conversation, the accused Manoj asked the complainant to give him a sum of Rs.50,000/- on the pretext of buying something for his paternal aunt. The complainant had given a sum of Rs.35,000/- to him and the accused had assured to return the same. On 29.08.2024, on asking of accused Manoj, the complainant had gone to Village Mundhal on the address as given by the former where the petitioner along with co-accused Manoj and Vikas was found to be present. When the complainant asked Manoj to give his money, the petitioner bolted the main door of the house, accused Vikas showed him a knife and then they started assaulting him and demanded ransom amount of Rs.1 crore and otherwise threatened to kill him. They also disclosed that they were already facing several criminal cases and could kill him if his family members disclosed anything to the police. On being threatened, the complainant called his uncle Anoop Dagar to come to Rohtak along with a sum of Rs.1 crore. Accused Manoj sent Vikas to fetch that money. Sometime thereafter, on finding opportunity, the complainant managed to flee and somehow reached Jind. Out of fear, he did not disclose about the incident to anyone. By alleging that the petitioner and co-accused had wrongfully confined him and had raised

2025:PHHC:108481



demand of ransom money and had snatched his vehicle and watch and had also extended threats to kill him, he prayed for taking action.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested and is in custody since 02.09.2024. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences along with the co-accused.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of two days in lodging the FIR which has not been satisfactorily explained but infact it was a case of money transaction between the complainant and the main accused. The complainant had taken a sum of Rs.10 lakhs from him and was not returning the same and to save himself from the liability to pay that amount, he had implicated the co-accused and himself falsely in this case. He is in custody since 02.09.2024. The trial will take sufficient time to conclude since not even a single witness has been examined so far. He has clean antecedents. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. No recovery has been effected from him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Custody certificate has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryan has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses if extended benefit of bail and as such, he does not deserve to be released on bail.

2025:PHHC:108481



6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have abducted the complainant for ransom and is further alleged to have assaulted him, criminally intimidated him and snatched his belongings including car and his watch. He is in custody since 02.09.2024. Trial has commenced but would take time to conclude as no witness has been examined. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. There is no basis for the contention that he would intimidate the witnesses or would abscond. It is a well-settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Taking into consideration the above-discussed facts, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, in addition to the conditions to be imposed by the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, the release of the petitioner shall also be subject to the following conditions :

(i) He shall not try to contact with the complainant or other material witnesses or intimidate any of them during the course of trial.

(ii) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

2025:PHHC:108481



(iii) He shall deposit his passport, if any, with the learned trial Court;

(iv) He shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.

(v) He will also disclose his present as well as permanent address before the learned trial Court at the time of furnishing of bonds and shall also give copy of his Aadhar Card, PAN Card if any and details of his mobile phone number(s) to the learned trial Court and in case, any change in his address or mobile phone number takes place, then he shall inform about the same to the learned trial Court in advance.

9. In the eventuality of breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to move an application seeking cancellation of the bail.

10. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

20.08.2025
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No