



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

234-I

CRM-M-10823-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 26.05.2026

Naveen @ Chhaila

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (for short - 'the BNSS'), the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.282 dated 11.09.2024, registered under Sections 308(2), 329(4), 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNS') (Sections 61(2), 111(2-ii) and 113(3) of the BNS added later on) at Police Station Narwana Sadar, District Jind, Haryana.

2. Briefly stated, present FIR was registered on complaint of one Baljit, alleging that he had received threatening calls demanding ransom of Rs.50,000/- per month or partnership in liquor business. On the basis of said complaint and disclosure statement of co-accused, the petitioner came to be nominated in present case. Allegations qua the petitioner is that he is a member of gang allegedly involved in extending threats and making extortion demands.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for concession of bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:

- (i) Petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused;
- (ii) Except the disclosure statement of co-accused, which itself is inadmissible in evidence, there is no other material to show complicity of the petitioner in the alleged offence;
- (iii) Similarly situated co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Boxer, Sandeep, Rajbir @ Raju and Ajay @ Dhola have already been granted regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide separate orders dated 11.02.2026 passed in CRM-M- 59602-2025, CRM-M-54032-2025, CRM-M-5272-2026 and CRM-M-46066-2025, respectively;
- (iv) Petitioner is in custody since 11.04.2025, i.e. for more than 1 year and 1 month;
- (v) That eye-witness, namely Gaurav, as well as the complainant, have not supported the prosecution case;
- (vi) The electronic evidence does not occasion any incriminating material qua the petitioner.

4. Custody certificate dated 23.05.2026 of the petitioner has been filed by learned State counsel and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has been behind the bars since 11.04.2025 i.e. for the last 1 year, 1 month and 13 days.

5. Learned State Counsel opposed the present petition on the following grounds:



- (i) The petitioner is a member of a gang involved in extortion;
- (ii) There is a specific allegation qua the petitioner that he along with the co-accused had telephonically threatened the complainant with a demand for money and had also locked the liquor vend, in respect whereof CCTV footage is stated to be available.

However, learned State counsel fairly admitted that the petitioner is not visible in the CCTV footage, though it is alleged that he had hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds merits in the present petition on the following grounds:

- (i) The petitioner is in custody since 11.04.2025, i.e. for the last 1 year, 1 month and 13 days;
- (ii) Except the disclosure statement of co-accused which is inadmissible in evidence, there is no other material on record to connect the present petitioner with the alleged commission of offence;
- (iii) Similarly situated co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Boxer, Sandeep, Rajbir @ Raju and Ajay @ Dhola have already been granted regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide separate orders dated 11.02.2026 passed in CRM-M- 59602-2025, CRM-M-54032-2025, CRM-M-5272-2026 and CRM-M-46066-2025, respectively;



(iii) The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period.

8. The concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment, as it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is a rule, jail is an exception. Hence, in view of aforementioned ground, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner after his release involves himself in any other case of similar nature, prosecution shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of his bail.

26.05.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No