



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-4590-2025
Decided on : 20.08.2025

Ajay Kumar . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Angraze Singh Dhindsa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. PK Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

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
Ajay Kumar	67	17.04.2024	379-B of IPC and 25 of the Arms Act	Dhand	Kaithal

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the allegations levelled by the complainant – Parvesh w/o Ajmer Singh, four young boys and a woman, who were sitting in a car, were allegedly involved in snatching gold earrings weighing about 6 grams from her ears, along with a gold Mangalsutra weighing about 7 grams.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, inasmuch as, during the deposition before the Court below, the complainant (PW3) and her daughter



Sumita (PW2) did not depose anything against the petitioner and in fact failed to identify him.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 11.05.2024, i.e., for a period of about 01 year and 03 months, and out of a total of 25 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far. Thus, the culmination of trial is likely to take considerable time.

In view of above, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel also does not dispute the factual position addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, as recorded here-above.

5. Be that as it may, I have carefully considered the submissions from both the sides. Without making any observations regarding the quality or standard of evidence upon which the prosecution seeks to build up its case, I take note of the fact that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 01 year and 03 months and trial is not running in its required pace.

In the given circumstances, I find it appropriate to entertain the petitioner's plea for regular bail, as it pertains to the fundamental question of an individual's liberty.

6. 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.

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



or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. Petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 20, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No