



CRM-M-15403-2025

1

224

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

CRM-M-15403-2025
Decided on : 18.11.2025

Sahil @ Teju

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.306 dated 09.10.2024, under Sections 305, 331(4) of BNS (Section 317(1) of BNS was added lateron), registered at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala.

2. As per allegations in the FIR, the incident of committing theft happened during the intervening night of 8/9.10.2024, which was noticed by the complainant in the morning and later on found that about 250 grams of gold jewellery and about 18 to 20 Kgs silver and cash amount of Rs. 2 lacs has been stolen by some unknown thieves. Even the DVR of the CCTV cameras installed there was also taken away by them.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is no direct

**CRM-M-15403-2025****2**

evidence against the petitioner, ensuring the proving of alleged offence. Moreover, other co-accused Yash was released on bail by the learned Duty Judicial Magistrate First Class (D/JMIC), Ambala, vide order dated 14.11.2024, apart one more co-accused-Raj Kumar vide order dated 11.11.2024.

Counsel also points out that third co-accused Sahil @ Chay was also granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 23.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-13626-2025. Copy of the order produced in the Court is taken on record.

Further, it is also argued that the recovery of the stolen articles, if any, has already been effected during investigation and thereupon even final report has been submitted to the Court. Petitioner is in custody for the last more than a period of one year and out of total 10 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. In the light of above, petitioner prays for the grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, has produced the custody certificate in Court and submits that the petitioner is an habitual offender and he has been convicted in 18 other criminal cases and 08 cases are under trial.

5. Faced with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner points out details given in paragraph No. 9 of the petition and submits that in six of the cases the petitioner has been convicted and then sentenced for already undergone period. He also points out that in five cases, the petitioner has already been acquitted.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and upon perusal of the record, it is observed that mere involvement of the petitioner in number of similar kind of cases does not warrant his detention for an indefinite period, rather one

**CRM-M-15403-2025****3**

year incarceration period already served is sufficient, before releasing the petitioner on bail, especially given that he is only 27 years of age, so that he may be allowed to reconsider his actions and rehabilitate himself in Society and to rebuild his career. None of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till date. It is also noticed that co-accused, namely Raj Kumar, Yash and Sahil @ Chay have already been granted the concession of bail. In view of the slow pace of trial, it is evident that the proceedings are likely to take considerable time. Therefore, the personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period.

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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereinabove, 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

November 18, 2025

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

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