

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



CRM-M-5052-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.02.2026

LALIT **... PETITIONER**
STATE OF HARYANA **VERSUS** **... RESPONDENT**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Reetesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.339 dated 12.10.2025 under Sections 115(2), 351(3), 308(5), 310(2), 3(5) of BNS registered at Police Station Shivaji Nagar, District Gurugram.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant and his brother had taken a friendly loan of Rs.7,00,000/- on interest from the petitioner and co-accused. However, the petitioner alongwith co-accused has received more than Rs.14-15 lakhs from the complainant by way of charging arbitrary interest @ 20% and in the event of non-payment, the petitioner and his accomplices not only threatened to kill the complainant and his family members but also gave injuries to them.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner and the complainant had financial business dealings and the present FIR is an outcome of misunderstanding arisen due to non-payment of money. The co-accused of the petitioner has already been granted regular bail by this

Court vide order dated 22.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-2271-2026 (Annexure

P-3). Moreover, the petitioner has already compromised the matter with the complainant and moved an application seeking quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months and he is not involved in any other case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, A.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and Mr. Dev Ahlawat, Advocate appearing on behalf of Mr. Ankit Yadav, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. However, learned counsel for the complainant admits the factum of compromise between the petitioner and the complainant. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months.

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

7. Keeping in view the above and in furtherance of the facts and circumstances of the present case that the petitioner has already compromised the matter with the complainant; the co-accused of the petitioner has already been granted regular bail by this Court; the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months; the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and therefore, continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released

on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

13.02.2026

Janki

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(H.S.GREWAL)

JUDGE