



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-19897 of 2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Varun alias Chilka alias Varun Rana

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Balvinder Sangwan and Ms. Enayat Dang, Advocates
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. The extraordinary jurisdiction, vested in this court by virtue of Section 528 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023', hereinafter being referred as "BNSS" only, has been invoked by virtue of present petition.

2. The above-mentioned petition has been filed in the backdrop of the fact that the petitioner is facing prosecution vide multiple FIRs, and that in all the above-mentioned cases, the benefit of bail has been accorded to him. Although the petitioner has been successful in submitting the surety bonds (along with personal bonds) in most of the cases, but in the following four cases, he has not been able to furnish surety bonds:-

FIR No.	Dated	Under Sections	Police Station
606	15.11.2025	25(1B)(a) of the Arms Act, 1959	Sector 58, District Faridabad.
109	31.10.2018	303, 506 & 34 IPC	Adarsh Nagar, District Faridabad
281	29.10.2025	25(1B)(a) and 25(1)(a) of the Arms Act, 1959	Old Faridabad, District Faridabad
398	06.06.2016	323, 324, 506 & 34 IPC	City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad

3. By virtue of present petition, the petitioner is seeking for the direction to the learned trial Courts, dealing with the above-mentioned cases to accept a common/combined surety bond, with common personal bond in all the cases.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a person of limited means, and that the benefit of bail has been accorded to the petitioner in the above-mentioned four cases, but despite best efforts by the petitioner vis-a-vis his family members, sureties for the above-mentioned four cases could not be procured and therefore, for want of furnishing bail bonds (surety bond plus personal bond) the petitioner is languishing in jail.

“Hani Nishad alias Mohammad Imran alias Vikky v. The State of Uttar Pradesh” 2018 SCC Online SC 3946, “Girish Gandhi v. The State of Uttar Pradesh” AIR 2024 Supreme Court 4396, “Nanak Chand Tayal v. State of Haryana” [Criminal Misc. No. M-33138 of 2022, decided on 02.09.2022], “Suresh Kumar Bawalia v. State of Haryana” 2021(4) Law Herald 2847, “Rajesh Singla v. State of Haryana” 2023(4) PLR 321 and “Bablu v. State of Haryana” [Criminal Misc. No. M-46124 of 2024, decided on 30.09.2024, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the petitioner be permitted to submit a common surety bond and common personal bond in all the above-mentioned four cases.

9. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel, since all the above-mentioned four cases pertain to different incidents and have no connection with each other, the permission to submit common surety bond cannot be accorded to the petitioner, as the same be violative of the laid down procedure.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. With regard to given fact-situation, the principle of law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of “Hani Nishad alias Mohammad Imran alias Vikky” (supra) is relevant. In the above-mentioned case, the petitioner was facing 31 criminal cases and the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India permitted the petitioner to furnish one personal bond and two surety bonds in one case and ordered the same to hold good in all the 31 cases.

12. Similar direction was issued by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of

India in the case of “Girish Gandhi” (supra), wherein, in 11 cases a common surety bond was permitted.

13. This High Court, in the case of “Nanak Chand Tayal” (supra), accorded similar benefit to the petitioner in 60 cases. However, a direction was issued that the surety bonds in all the cases will be common and the personal bond will be filed separately.

14. In the case of “Suresh Kumar Bawalia” (supra) a surety bond and personal bond submitted by the petitioner was allowed to be treated surety bond in all the 96 cases and the petitioner was directed to furnish personal bond in all the cases separately.

15. Similar benefit was accorded by the coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of “Rajesh Singla” (supra), wherein the petitioner was facing trial in 41 cases. Id in the case of “Bablu” (Supra), also, wherein the petitioner had 12 cases against him, the similar benefit was afforded.

16. If the factual matrix of the present case is analysed in the light of above-mentioned principles of law, it transpires that filing a common surety bond in more than one cases is permissible.

17. Thus, taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is facing extreme difficulty in furnishing bail bonds in all the four cases separately, it is hereby ordered that the trial Courts dealing with the above-mentioned cases will permit the petitioner to furnish a common surety bond in all the four cases. However, the personal bond shall be furnished separately, by the petitioner, in all the cases.

18. With the above-mentioned observations, the present petition is

hereby **partly allowed**, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

April 29, 2026
“DK”

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