



266

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

CRM-M-33731-2025**Date of Decision:07.07.2025**

RINKU KUMAR

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Ravinder Bangar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.85 dated 25.03.2023, registered under Sections 406, 420 & 201 of IPC, Police Station Barara, District Ambala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case was registered after a delay of more than 02 months. Still the petitioner was not named in the FIR. He further refers to the compromise Deed (Annexure P-3) to contend that both the parties have entered into a compromise on 24.04.2025. Moreover, the petitioner and the complainant side had filed a quashing petition i.e. CRM-M-29130-2025 before this Court with a prayer to quash the FIR and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom. Now, the



statements have been recorded in the said FIR regarding compromise. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 30.01.2025 and is in custody for the last more than 05 months.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. He further submits that he is involved in 08 more cases.

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

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner has already compromised the matter with the complainant side and joint statements of the complainant as well as accused have been recorded by the concerned Court. Even otherwise, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last 05 months. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

07.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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