



CRM-M-32069-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

CRM-M-32069-2026
Decided on : 03.06.2026

Hamid @ Haamid

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate
for the petitioner (through V.C.)

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Hamid @ Haamid, aged 39 years	31	26.02.2025	305 of BNS (Sections 331(4), 317(2) of BNS added later on) (380, 457, 411 of IPC)	Punhana	Nuh

2. As per allegations, complainant Nijjar Mohd. Moved complaint regarding theft of 1 Kg silver bangles, 2 tola gold hasli, Rs. 10,000/- cash, one mobile phone by some unknown thieves. During investigation, petitioner was involved as one of the accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Sahib.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that there is no other case against the petitioner and he has been falsely involved in the present case. After arrest of the petitioner, nothing could be recovered from his possession. He further submits that initially the petitioner had filed one anticipatory bail petition i.e. CRM-M-22987-2026 (Annexure P-3) before this Court, however, withdrew the same on 27.04.2026 with liberty to surrender before the Court and in such eventuality further direction was issued by this Court to decide his bail application on the same day. He further submits that for the last one month, the petitioner is in custody and once nothing could be recovered after his arrest by the investigating officer, any longer incarceration is of no meaningful purpose.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, the petitioner has already undergone 29 days, period inside jail.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner, confirms the facts including the role attributed to the petitioner and also the stage of trial. Thus, prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available on file.

7. Considering the aforementioned facts, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed.

**CRM-M-32069-2026**

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. **Petition stands disposed of.**

June 03, 2026*reena*

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE