

218 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2028.PHHC.073190



CRM-M-22607-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

RAMPHAL @ MOLLU

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Sunil Saharan, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through video conferencing)

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG Haryana.

Ms. Veena Hooda, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.14 dated 09.01.2026 registered under Sections 115, 117(2), 3(5), 109(1) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 323, 325, 34, 307 IPC) at Police Station Sadar, Hisar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a case was registered on the complaint of Saroj alleging that on 06.01.2026, her husband, namely, Nirmal had left the house with ₹1,00,000/- cash wearing a gold chain and two gold rings and later, during the night, he was found in an injured condition after allegedly being assaulted by unknown persons, and the said cash and gold articles were found missing. Suspicion was raised against one Titu and 10–12 other persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. No specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 13 days and is not involved in any other case. He, thus,

prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. He further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 13 days.

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

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner; the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 13 days; he is not involved in any other case; the conclusion of trial is likely to take time and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, *'bail is rule and jail is exception'*.

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

8. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
Janki

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