



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

218

CRM-M-28627-2025

Date of Decision: 19.11.2025

NARENDER ALIAS NEERAJ

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ajay Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G., Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the indulgence of this Court for grant of regular bail in a case arising out of FIR No.22 dated 15.01.2021, registered under Sections 392 and 394 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 379-B and 120-B IPC added later on), at Police Station Shivaji Colony, District Rohtak.

2. As per the allegations, in the morning of 15.01.2021, the complainant, Sitaram Verma son of Balbir Singh, was present in his jewellery shop when two youths reached there and, by extending threats and showing knives, robbed him of an amount of ₹8,000/- and certain silver articles kept in the shop and thereafter fled from the spot. The petitioner was nominated as an accused during the course of investigation and was arrested on 31.01.2021. He was granted the benefit of regular bail vide order dated 13.07.2021. Subsequently, he absented himself during the course of trial, leading to cancellation of his bail on **16.10.2023** and forfeiture of his bonds.



Proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C. were initiated against him, and he was declared a proclaimed person/offender vide order dated 11.03.2024. He was arrested again on 20.12.2024 and is in custody since then.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. It is submitted that he is in custody for a considerable period and the trial is likely to take time to conclude, as only 2 out of 13 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. His further incarceration, according to counsel, would serve no useful purpose and therefore he deserves the concession of bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, while placing on record the custody certificate, submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender, being involved in more than two other cases in which he has also been declared a proclaimed offender. It is argued that there are chances of his absconding again if granted bail, and therefore the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 20.12.2024. The trial is evidently likely to take time to conclude. In the considered opinion of this Court, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody any further. The benefit of bail cannot be denied solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other cases.

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that a case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released



on regular bail, subject to furnishing personal and surety bonds two sureties to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, and further subject to the condition that he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat, or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case. He shall appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing unless exempted by the Court. He shall surrender his passport, if any, furnish details of his mobile number(s) and Aadhaar card, and shall not change his mobile number(s) or address during the pendency of the trial.

8. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

November 19, 2025

Nisha-1

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No