



CRM-M-19058-2026

-1-

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

223

CRM-M-19058-2026
Date of decision : 29.05.2026

RAJESH KUMAR

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.504 dated 26.10.2023 under Sections 406/420/506 IPC, 1860 (Sections 467/468/471 added later on) (corresponding to Sections 316(2)/318(4)/351(2)/338/336(3)/340(2) BNS, 2023), Police Station Parao Ambala Cantt., District Ambala.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, in connivance with his co-accused, allegedly received a sum of Rs.2 lakhs from the complainant and facilitated his introduction to the main accused, Mohd. Rasid. It is alleged that Mohd. Rasid received the remaining amount from the complainant on the pretext of arranging employment for the complainant's daughter, nephew, and the son of his brother-in-law.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no incriminating material which would connect him with the commission of alleged offence. It is submitted that co-accused Mohd. Rasid has been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 15.05.2026. He has placed on record a copy of the order dated 15.05.2026, which is taken on record. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 13.11.2025. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time because none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits that the petitioner is in custody since 13.11.2025 and none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody since 13.11.2025, co-accused Mohd. Rasid has already been granted bail and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

**CRM-M-19058-2026****-3-**

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 learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 29, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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