



CRM-M-2509-2025

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

CRM-M-2509-2025
Date of Decision: 16.05.2025

Arjun Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Vansh Chawla, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen K. Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0420	15.11.2024	Bhuna, District Fatehabad (Haryana)	115/127(2)/304/308(6)/ 351(3)/61 of BNS

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Per paragraph 21 of the bail application and 11 of the status report, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	19	16.01.2024	120-B/379/34 IPC	Bhuna
2	32	18.07.2024	354/376(2)(n)/506/34 IPC	Women Police Station, Hisar

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the translated version of FIR, which reads as follows:

“To, SHO Police Station Bhuna. Subject- Application for legal action. Respected Sir, it is requested that I Sanjay Kumar son of Harish Kumar am resident of ward no. 11 Bhuna. Yesterday on 14.11.2024 I had come to Bhuna Bazaar for any work and I had acquaintance with Kavita resident of Bhuna from long time. I talked with Kavita on her mobile number whose number is not remember to me. Kavita told me that you come at her house with three beers. At about 8 o'clock in the evening I went to her house with three beers. There I met with Kavita and one unknown lady, we all three had drunk beers



CRM-M-2509-2025

by sitting there. That Kavita took me in house of her neighbour and at the time that unknown lady also entered in the room and Kavita told me that her name is Manju and I have called her specially from Hisar. That after saying this Kavita in pursuance to plan went outside the room and Manju took out her clothes and I also took out my clothes and at that time one Sonu alias Arjun entered in the room by opening the gate and he prepared video of mine and Manju and Kavita and Sonu alias Arjun and Reena did beating with me and I was made hostage there and started demanding Rs. five lacs by showing the threat of implicating in case under section 376 against me and continuously beaten me and also gave life threat to me and Kavita took out key of motorcycle from my pocket and made me hostage throughout night. I do not know complete name address of Sonu and Reena and Manju. Kavita, Sonu, Reena and Manju have done beating with me in accordance of conspiracy by making my video with Manju by showing threat of registering case of 376 against me and today morning Sonu and Reena took away my mobile phone by snatching from me. Now I have come to my family members with great difficulty by making promise of arranging money to Kavita. Legal action be taken against Kavita etc. Date 15.11.2024 Applicant SD Sanjay Kumar, Sanjaykumar son of Harish kumar resident of ward no. 11 Bhuna mobile number 94169-XXXXX.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that 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 status report.

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

“13. That as far as specific role of the petitioner/accused is concerned the petitioner/accused is part of criminal conspiracy hatched alongwith other co-accused persons and is specifically named in the FIR. The petitioner/accused alongwith co-accused trapped the complainant and after making his obscene video threatened him to gave Rs.5 Lakhs and kept him locked in room entire night.”

REASONING:

7. Allegations are of trapping the complainant and making obscene video and keeping him locked in room for entire night. Alleged mobile phone has already been recovered. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.



CRM-M-2509-2025

8. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

9. 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. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

CONDITIONS:

10. 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 Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

11. 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)	

12. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

13. 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



CRM-M-2509-2025

Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation, 2018 All SCR (Cr.) 458); and Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

14. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the victim, 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 firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a 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 of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under 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.

15. 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."

16. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

17. 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



CRM-M-2509-2025

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.

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

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

20. 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 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.

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

22. Concerned officer of the Legal Services Authority to ensure timely payment to the legal aid counsel.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

16.05.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.