

107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-62858-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision:06.02.2025

SAGAR

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. S.K. Bishnoi, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J.

CRM-4388-2025

For the reasons given in the application, the same is allowed
and the main case is taken on board today itself.

CRM-M-62858-2024

Prayer in the second petition under Section 483 of BNSS,
2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case having FIR
No.007 dated 04.01.2020 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 332, 353, 395, 427, 511 of IPC and Section 397 IPC and
Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act added later on at Police Station
Bhuna, District Fatehabad, Haryana.



2. Counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner was granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 28.06.2021 (Annexure P-2) and thereafter the petitioner was regularly appearing before the trial Court. That unfortunately on 18.07.2023, the petitioner was unable to appear before the trial Court due to certain unavoidable circumstances which resulted into cancellation of his bail. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the bail of the petitioner was cancelled by the trial Court in a hasty manner without taking into consideration the fact that this was single default on part of the petitioner. It is further submitted that after the issuance of the warrants of arrest of the petitioner himself surrendered before the trial Court on 15.10.2024 and since then is in custody.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Addl.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and while resisting the present petition submits that petitioner got absented on 18.07.2023 without any intimation to the trial Court. As a result of which his bail was cancelled and the trial Court issued non-bailable warrants of arrest against the petitioner, in accordance with law. It is further submitted that petitioner is a habitual offender. However, the State counsel has not disputed the fact that subsequently the present petitioner surrendered before the Court concerned. The State counsel apprised the Court that till date only two

witnesses out of total 22 witnesses are examined on behalf of the State.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the counsel for the parties.

6. In view of the fact that earlier the petitioner was granted regular bail vide order dated 28.06.2021 (Annexure P-2) and that it will take time for the trial to terminate, no purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any longer period.

7. For the foregoing reasons, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

06.02.2025

Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(KARAMJIT SINGH)

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No