



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

265

CRM-M-2067-2025

Date of decision: 2nd August, 2025

Dixit

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. S.S. Sandhawalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 169 dated 25.04.2024 registered under Sections 324, 379-B, 392, 397 and 450 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Meham, Rohtak.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Geeta Rani on 25.04.2024 alleging therein that on the same day, at about 2:00 PM, she was present at her house when two youths who were wearing helmets came there on the pretext of delivering some courier. They at once snatched gold chain and *Mangalsutra* worn by her in her neck and when she protested, one of them showed a pistol whereas another attacked upon her with a knife thereby injuring her abdomen and hands. They also snatched her purse containing cash amount



of Rs. 2500/- and then fled. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, CCTV footages of the cameras installed in the vicinity had been obtained and the assailants were seen running from the spot on a motorcycle. The investigation revealed that they were the present petitioner and the co-accused Davinder. Both of them were apprehended and arrested on 01.05.2024. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the offence. The petitioner got recovered a country made pistol and the clothing worn by him at the time of occurrence and also disclosed that the snatched chain had been sold by him at the shop of Bhagwati Jewelers. The owner of Bhagwati jewelers was joined into investigation and disclosed that the petitioner had given chain to him for preparing some new ornaments and he had melted the same. The knife used at the time of occurrence was also recovered. Offence under Section 379-B was added. It was also revealed that the petitioner had hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and by using the scooty of his mother had entered into the house of the complainant on the pretext of giving some parcel. The petitioner and co-accused had struck blows with the knife on the person of the complainant and had snatched her gold chain. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. He is in custody since 01.05.2024. A false recovery has been planted upon him. The CCTV footage does not show him at the place of occurrence. His face is not visible in any of the CCTV footage. Trial will take considerable time to conclude since even a single witness has not been examined. He does not



have any criminal antecedents. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be given benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, both of them are alleged to have gone to the house of the complainant on a scooty after hiding their faces and are alleged to have robbed the complainant/snatched her gold chain and money from her after causing hurt to her. The petitioner is in custody since 01.05.2024. None of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Trial will obviously take time to conclude. The petitioner's counsel has shown two CCTV footages in which the complainant is not shown. No test identification parade is stated to have been conducted. The petitioner has clean antecedents. In the given circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Keeping in view the above discussed fact but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds by two sureties to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty



Magistrate concerned. He shall appear before the concerned Police Station once on the first Monday of every month. He shall 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(s) takes place, then he shall inform about the same to the learned trial Court in advance.

7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

2nd August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*

2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*