



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

240

CRM-M-55735-2025

Date of decision: 8th December, 2025

Talim

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Akram Hussain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The petitioner is seeking indulgence of this Court by filing this petition for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 840 dated 13.12.2018 registered under Sections 353, 186, 307, 148 and 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Nuh, District Nuh, on the allegations that he along with the co-accused had formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object thereof, had opened an assault upon police officials while they had tried to stop the co-accused and himself and had fired shot at them with intent to kill them. He was apprehended at the spot. He had been extended benefit of bail on 03.09.2019. He absented himself on 26.05.2022 due to which his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. Proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. were initiated against him. He was declared a proclaimed



offender/person on 26.05.2022. He was arrested again and is in custody since 15.07.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he in in custody since long. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He is ready to abide by the terms and conditions to be imposed upon him. His absence in the past was not intentional but was due to the reason that he was working in Mumbai and not aware about the pendency of the proceedings before the trial Court. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Custody certificate filed by learned State counsel is taken on record. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner had remained absconded for a period of more than six years. There are chances of his absconding again, if extended benefit of bail. He is a habitual offender and several cases have been registered against him. The allegations against him are even otherwise quite serious. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

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

6. The petitioner who had been declared a proclaimed person is now in custody since 15.07.2025. Prosecution witnesses have since been examined, however, a perusal of the copies of the *zimni* orders as placed on record by learned counsel for the petitioner reveals that trial will take time to conclude since proclamation proceedings have been initiated against one of



the accused. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds of two sureties to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court and further subject to giving details of his present/permanent address, cell phone number and Aadhar Card, at the time of furnishing bonds before the learned trial Court. That apart, the petitioner shall also ensure his presence before the SHO, of concerned Police Station on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial.

7. On his failure to abide by any of these conditions, the learned trial Court will be at liberty to cancel his bail.

8. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

8th December, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No