

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

2025:PHHC:168120



(218)

CRM-M-28522-2025

Date of Decision: 02.12.2025

Aadil Khan

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present:- Mr. A.P.S. Mann, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL.J (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.366 dated 27.09.2021, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at Police Station, City Rewari.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner, at the outset, submits that at a later stage offence under Section 34 IPC has been added in the FIR and the same may also be added in the prayer clause of the petition.

As per the oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, since the offence under Section 34 IPC was added at a later stage in the FIR, the registry is directed to carry out necessary correction in the prayer clause.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that Hakmudeen was carrying a bogus driving license and on his disclosure statement, one Rahul was named. Thereafter, the said Rahul named the present petitioner from whom some blank forms were recovered. He submits that petitioner has already undergone a custody period of more than 09 months in the present case. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He submits that petitioner is in custody for the last more than 09 months as on 01.12.2025. He, upon instructions, submits that out of the 12 prosecution witnesses only one has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In view of the aforesaid submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 09 months in the present case, out of the 12 prosecution witnesses, only 01 has been examined till date and since the trial is likely to take a long time, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as his continuous detention would not serve the ends of justice.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

02.12.2025
lucky

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No