

CRM-M-19650-2025

2025:PHHC:128336



110+219

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-19650-2025

Date of decision: September 16, 2025

Manjeet Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

**Present:-** Mr. Munish Raj Chaudhary, Advocate for  
 Mr. Sushil Kumar Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)**

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.863 dated 31.10.2023, registered for offences punishable under Section 379-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), at Police Station Civil Line Sirsa, District Sirsa.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that on 31.10.2023 at about 07:35 p.m., the victim along with her husband (complainant) were walking in the Court Complex, Sirsa, and when they reached near the main gate, two boys came on a motorcycle and snatched the chain made of gold weighing 30 grams and ran away from the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 04.12.2023. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further

**CRM-M-19650-2025**

iterated that the requisite Test Identification Parade (TIP) was not conducted, in accordance with law. Learned counsel has also iterated that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of about 02 years. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, hence, he ought not to be extended concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record the custody certificate dated 15.09.2025, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 04.12.2023 and is in continuous custody since then. Upon culmination of the investigation, the challan has been presented on 26.01.2024. Total 11 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which, 05 have been examined till date. It is not in dispute that prime prosecution witnesses, namely, injured and FIR/ complainant/ husband of the victim stand examined. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. As per custody certificate dated 15.09.2025 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 01 year, 09 months and 12 days. Further, as per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in other FIR(s). However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the

CRM-M-19650-2025

petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another*, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State*, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477 & judgments of this Court in CRM-M No.38822-2022 titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana*, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. Concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM /Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the CJM/ Duty Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/ Duty Magistrate as directed

CRM-M-19650-2025

hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

- 9                    Ordered accordingly.
10.                Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
11.                Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)  
JUDGE

September 16, 2025  
mahavir

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:        | Yes/No |