



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-71365-2025
Decided on : 23.12.2025

Chandru . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Chandru	198	04.09.2024	303, 111, 317(2) of BNS, 2023	Rai	Sonepat

2. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel informed that after registration of the FIR, secret information regarding the commission of the offence was received from the complainant – Ajay Kumar Verma (Advocate). At first instance, accused Suraj (presently on bail), Karma @ Avtar, and Vishal @ Prakash @ Vishu (presently on bail), were arrested and joined in the investigation. During the course of their disclosure statements, the name of another person, i.e., Chandru (petitioner herein), also came to light.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that a false case has been planted against the petitioner, and there is no direct evidence linking him to the commission of the offence. It is further submitted that the incident allegedly took place on 24.08.2024, whereas the FIR was registered only on 04.09.2024, after a delay of about ten days. Considering that complainant is an educated professional in the field of advocacy, such a delay raises the possibility of introduction of false allegations. Moreover, complainant has already been examined in Court, and petitioner in custody for over one year and two months.

Besides, learned counsel submits that name of the petitioner has been involved in the present case, in the subsequent disclosure statements of the already arrested co-accused. Further, two co-accused of the petitioner, i.e., Suraj and Vishal @ Prakash @ Vishu, have been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide common order dated 19.11.2025, passed in **CRM-M-4465-2025 & connected case**, titled as, “**Suraj v. State of Punjab**” (Annexure P-2). Therefore, in view of the above and by claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that petitioner and his other co-accused are habitual offenders and have been found involved in several other cases.

Further submits that keeping in view the nature of allegations and the antecedents of the petitioner, granting bail at this stage, may pose a risk of the petitioner hampering with evidence, influencing witnesses, or flee from the jurisdiction. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of present petition.

However, so far as other factual assertions made here-above are concerned, learned State counsel does not dispute the same.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto.

6. Taking into account all the facts and circumstances as explained by the respective learned counsel and noticed here-above, this Court observes that the complainant has not offered any satisfactory explanation for the delay of about ten days in getting the FIR registered. However, no final conclusion on this aspect can be drawn at the stage of the present bail petition, as the same would be a matter to be examined and adjudicated upon by the trial Court on the basis of evidence led during trial.

It is further noticed that the arrest of the petitioner in the present case is not founded upon any direct or independent evidence collected under the FIR, but is based solely on the subsequent disclosure statements of the already arrested co-accused. The evidentiary value, legality and authenticity of such disclosure statements are also matters to be determined by the trial Court at the appropriate stage.

In these circumstances, coupled with the fact that co-accused Suraj and Vishal @ Prakash @ Vishu, who are similarly situated, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide common order dated 19.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-4465-2025 and other connected case, this Court finds substance in the plea of parity raised by the petitioner. Further detention of the petitioner for an indefinite period is not warranted, particularly when the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future. Accordingly, prayer for grant of regular bail deserves acceptance.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial



Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending crl. Misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

December 23, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*