



CRM-M-3518-2026 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-3518-2026
Decided on : 09.07.2026

YOGESH @ YOGESH CHAHAL Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH
Present: Mr. Narender Pal Bhardwaj, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Birender Bikram Attrey, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Yogesh @ Yogesh Chahal, aged about 25 years	240	19.08.2024	309(4), 309(6) of BNS (section 238 of BNS added later on)	Kalayath	Kaithal

2. FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, Satnam. As per the prosecution case, complainant was driving his Swift Dzire car for Uber when it was booked by the accused persons. It is alleged that after boarding the vehicle, the accused persons forcibly snatched the car and also took away its keys, complainant's mobile phone, Aadhaar card, purse, and other belongings. Relevant contents of the FIR read as under:-



“I, Satnam, son of Dharambir, am resident of Mangalaura, police station Madhuban, District Karnal and I drive my car No. HR-45 D 4362, white colored SWIFT DZIRE brand car, in UBER company. On 18.08.2024, at around 4/5.00 PM, my car was booked by two persons through UBER company, from Murthal toll to go to Kaithal. When I, with those two persons, reached near Titram Mod/turn highway, those persons told me that we have to go near Bata village. You drop us at village Bata. When I reached near village Bata with those two persons in my car, the said persons took me on a local road in the area around village Bata. I was scared. Then I turned my car back and came near village Bata highway. Then those persons asked me to go from village Bata towards Kaithal and asked me to drop them at a hotel on the way. At around 9/10 pm, when I took those persons in my car and reached at some distance from village Kailram bus stand, the person sitting behind me, caused injury by hitting me on the head with something and started strangling me by putting the seat belt of the car around my neck. I opened the window of the car with full force and got free from their clutches by applying force. Then those two persons forcefully looted my car keys, car and my purse and my phone (whose number is 8595605402). My purse had 3000 rupees, Aadhar card, PAN card, ATM HDFC, RC, DL, METRO CARD and some of my photographs. I request you to take the strictest action against those who robbed me of my car, purse and mobile phone. SD/- SATNAM.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in judicial custody for a period of more than one year and ten months. It is further submitted that there are 17 prosecution witnesses cited in the present case, out of whom only three have been examined so far, while two witnesses have been given up by the prosecution.

Learned counsel further submits that complainant-Satnam, who is the actual victim of the alleged occurrence, has already been examined before the trial Court. Therefore, considering the substantial period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner and the fact



that testimony of the complainant has already been recorded, learned counsel prays that petitioner be enlarged on regular bail in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual assertions made on behalf of the petitioner. However, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail, he submits that apart from the present case, petitioner is involved in two other criminal cases and, therefore, does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. Upon a specific query put by the Court, learned State counsel fairly submits that petitioner has already been granted bail in both the said cases.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

7. It is not in dispute that petitioner has already been released on bail in the aforesaid two criminal cases. If, during the course of trial, complainant has duly identified the petitioner as one of the perpetrators of the present occurrence, it shall always be open for the prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail granted to the petitioner in the earlier cases, if so advised and permissible in law.

8. Be that as it may, having regard to the total period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, the fact that complainant/victim has already been examined before the trial Court, stage of the trial, and the fact that petitioner is already on bail in the other two cases, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner incarcerated for an indefinite



CRM-M-3518-2026

4

period during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

9. Therefore, considering the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, period of custody already undergone, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.07.2026
Lavisha

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