



273

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

CRM-M-37096-2025

Date of Decision:21.07.2025

RAHUL ALIAS MANN SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Rajesh Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Komal Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.318 dated 28.11.2019, registered under Sections 323, 341, 34, 506 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 325, 307 and 120-B IPC added later on), Police Station Uklana, District Hisar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case was initially registered on 28.11.2019. He further submits that the petitioner was initially arrested in the preset case on 20.01.2020 and was granted the concession of regular bail by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge on 16.07.2020. Thereafter, the petitioner was regularly appearing before the trial Court, however, due to his absence, his bail was cancelled on



22.08.2024 and the bail bonds were ordered to be forfeited to the state. Learned counsel next contends that the petitioner was again taken in custody on 12.09.2024 and is in custody since then. Even otherwise, the petitioner was already on bail in the present case and he was allegedly armed with a *danda* and had attacked on the head of Sajjan. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner is not in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution and his further custody will not serve any useful purpose.

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 is absconder and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner already remained in custody for 06 months and was granted the concession of regular bail on 16.07.2020. However, due to non appearance his bail was cancelled and he was again taken in custody on 12.09.2024. Now, the material witnesses have been examined and the further 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. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.



(ii) The petitioner shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.

(iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioner shall surrender his passport, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case he is not holder of the same, he shall swear an affidavit to that effect.

(v) The petitioner shall also file his affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by him during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, he shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.

(vi) In case, the petitioner is involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.

(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two heavy local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner.

7. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

21.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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