



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

221

**CRM-M No.12617 of 2026
Date of decision : 13.3.2026
Date of uploading : 13.3.2026**

Mulkraj Meena @ Mulkraj**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Aman Priye Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.291 dated 26.11.2025 under Sections 305, 3(5), 317(2), 238, 324(4), 111(2)(b) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station New Colony, District Gurugram.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

'It is respectfully submitted that I, Neetu alias Indu, wife of Naveen Yadav, resident of House No. 653/10, Gali No. 10, Krishna Colony, Gurugram. My husband works in People Strong Company. My husband owns a vehicle, Scorpio No. HR26FY9728, Chassis No. MAITA2YS252188944 and Engine No. YSS4379388, Model Name Scorpio Classic SMT 75, year 2025, black in color. As per his daily routine, after finishing his duty, he



used to park the vehicle at some distance from our house. On 26.11.2025 at about 1:30 AM, he parked the vehicle and came home, had dinner, and went to sleep. In the morning at about 7:00 AM, when we went to check the vehicle, it was not found at the place where it had been parked. Thereafter, we searched for the vehicle on our own, but could not locate it. Some unknown person has stolen the above-mentioned vehicle. Therefore, legal action may kindly be taken against the unknown thief. Sd/- Indu Mobile: 9891909658 HC Poonam No. 671/GGM Police Station New Colony, Gurugram.'

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.12.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that, in any case, investigation qua the FIR in question is complete and challan already stands filed. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is a man aged 35 years and is sole bread earner of his family. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 13.3.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 11.12.2025 whereinafter, investigation was carried out and the challan was presented on 28.1.2026. Total 21 prosecution witnesses have been cited, but none has been examined till date as charges are yet to be framed. It is thus indubitable



that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. As per custody certificate dated 13.3.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 3 months and 13 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in 2 more FIRs. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.



Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall also furnish either a FDR or bank guarantee in the name of Court releasing him on bail to the tune of ₹50,000/-.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as



directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

- 9. Ordered accordingly.
- 10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

13.3.2026
Ashwanii

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