



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-35140-2025
Reserved on: 22nd August, 2025
Pronounced on: 29th August, 2025**

Bilal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

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

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

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
684	06.11.2024	Industrial Sector 29 Panipat	140(3), 190, 191(3), 309(4), 61(2), 317(3) and 310(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNS")

2. As per the allegations, the complainant Ramtej Yadav is a driver by profession. On the night of 05.11.2024, he had left from Panipat after loading goods in his canter vehicle bearing registration No.HR67D1187 for Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh. When he reached near police lines Panipat, a car came from behind and the occupants of the same stopped



it in front of the vehicle of the complainant thereby making him stop his vehicle. The occupants who were 5-6 in number, alighted from their vehicle and forcibly made the complainant sit in their vehicle by showing that he had caused an accident. They blindfolded his eyes with a cloth, snatched his money as well as mobile phone and then after tying him with some tree in an abandoned place, they left. The complainant somehow got himself released and informed the police. The aforementioned FIR was initially registered against unknown persons. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The robbed vehicle of the complainant was recovered from Gannaur, Haryana in an abandoned condition. Subsequently, the same was taken into possession by the police. The complainant recorded his supplementary statement thereby disclosing the registration number of the vehicle which was brought by the culprits. It was revealed that the same was owned by accused Adil who was arrested on 07.11.2024. He suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which, the accused Mukammil was nominated as a co-accused. The accused Mukammil was arrested on 09.11.2024. He too suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he had joined the gang of Deepak and Soyeb, who used to rob the drivers of canter and other vehicles moving on highway. The looted vehicles were taken to Loni, Ghaziabad, whereas the material recovered from the looted vehicles used to be received and purchased by them on lower prices and was sold further. He also disclosed that the petitioner was also involved with him in these acts. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. Offences under Sections 61(2), 317(3) and 310(2) of BNS were added. The petitioner was arrested on 17.11.2024. He too suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement. Investigation now



stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. He has been in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. His involvement in another case cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. No recovery has been effected from him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has argued that the petitioner has criminal antecedents since he is involved in one other case of similar nature. It is argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object thereof, is alleged to have abducted the complainant from his vehicle and robbed him of his vehicle as well as the goods loaded therein. The petitioner is in custody since 17.11.2024. The trial will take time to conclude. His involvement in another case cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the above discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest the same prejudices the trial, this



Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

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

29th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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