



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-18895-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.05.2026

NEMPAL

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep S. Majithia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail is **third** petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of ‘the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023’. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.290 dated 26.11.2024, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code, Police Station Sanoli, Panipat, District Panipat.
2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of



this case came into being on a complaint submitted by 'Rajinder' son of 'Sahi Ram', who had stated that his son namely 'Ankush' and brother 'Joginder' were confined in District Jail, Panipat on account of conviction in a criminal case. According to complainant, in the same jail 'Nempal' (the petitioner), too, was lodged who came in touch with 'Ankush' and 'Joginder', and convinced them that he had linked with officers in High Court and he could manage their acquittal on payment of Rs.60,00,000/-. According to complainant, convinced with the assurance given by the petitioner a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- was given to him, but despite lapse of more than 1 year he could not secure their acquittal. According to complainant, when he asked for return of the money, the petitioner refused to do so.

3. Reply has already been filed by learned State counsel. The same be taken on record. Custody certificate has been filed by learned State counsel. The same, too, be taken on record.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that second petition for bail was dismissed by this Court on 28.10.2025, and from the date of dismissal of second bail petition a long period of more than six months has elapsed and there is no significant progress in the trial, and thus a fresh ground is available to the petitioner to file present petition. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in the present case, the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than one year, four months and twenty two days. As per learned counsel for the petitioner the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, as out of eighteen prosecution witnesses only five have been



examined so far. According to learned counsel for the petitioner in view of above-mentioned changed scenario, the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of bail.

6. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. The thrust of argument of learned State counsel has been on the plea that this is third petition for bail filed by the petitioner, and that from the date of dismissal of second bail petition, no significant change in circumstance has taken place. The learned State counsel has further contended that otherwise also the petitioner is a person having a checkered history as he is already facing prosecution in eight other cases also. According to learned State counsel no fresh ground for bail has accrued to the petitioner, and therefore, the present petition is not maintainable and deserves dismissal.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of record shows that the last petition for bail (i.e. second petition) was dismissed on 28.10.2025. From the date of dismissal of second petition, which was decided on merit, a period of little more than six months has elapsed which by any standard does not amount to a very long period, justifying the filing of present petition for bail on the ground of prolonged incarceration. Otherwise also the offence for which the petitioner is being prosecuted is punishable with imprisonment up to seven years and out of that, the sentence already undergone by the petitioner is only one year and four months. The above-mentioned period of incarceration cannot be treated to be such a long period, which may justify the claim that there is delay in trial.

9. Thus, taking into consideration the cumulative effect of above-mentioned factors, it is hereby observed that this third petition for bail filed by



the petitioner is without any merit and deserves dismissal. Hence, the same is hereby **dismissed** accordingly.

10. However in view of peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the learned trial Court is hereby advised to expedite the trial.

11. All other pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed off, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

11.05.2026

vipin

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