

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:163093



239

CRM-M-64646-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:21.11.2025

Manga Singh @ Manga

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. H.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

The petitioner is seeking indulgence of this Court for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.16, dated 02.06.2019, registered under Sections 452, 148, 149 IPC (offence under Section 201 IPC added subsequently), at Police Station Khemkaran, District Tarn Taran.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant – Raj Kumar on 02.06.2019, alleging that the petitioner had formed a membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and had criminally trespassed the house of the complainant on the night of 30.05.2019. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested and was subsequently granted benefit of bail. He absented himself again, due to which his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State.

Proclamation proceedings were initiated against him and he was declared as a proclaimed person vide order dated 29.05.2025. He was arrested again on 19.09.2025 and is in custody since then.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that absence of the petitioner was not intentional and he could not appear before the learned trial Court due to sufficient reasons. He is now in custody since 19.09.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. The subject offences are triable by the Magistrate. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and has submitted that since the petitioner was previously declared as a proclaimed persons, therefore, there are chances of his absconding again, if extended benefit of bail and therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is in custody in this magisterial trial since 19.09.2025. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. In view of 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. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bonds with two sureties in the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Court

concerned/Duty Magistrate and 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 except when his presence has been exempted by the trial Court. He shall furnish details of his cell phone and Aadhaar card, and shall keep his cell phone switched on during the pendency of the trial.

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

21.11.2025

harjeet

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE