

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

235

CRM-M-52447-2025 (O&M)**Date of decision: 04.02.2026**

Sanju

*.....Petitioner**Versus*

State of Haryana

*.....Respondent***CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY**

Present: Ms. Sakshi Khera, Advocate for the petitioner. (through V.C)

Mr. Vishal Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS is for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.469 dated 11.11.2018 under Sections 148,149,323,325,307,384,511,379B,506 IPC registered at P.S Police Station NIT Faridabad, District Faridabad.

2. Relevant facts as emerging from the documents on record be noticed hereinbelow:

Dinesh Sharma son of Ramdutt Sharma set the criminal law in motion by filing a complaint pointing therein that at about 10.30 PM on 03.11.2018, he was visiting Oporup Hotel and was at the first floor, when suddenly 20-25 persons armed with pistol, iron rods and iron hammers arrived there in four vehicles. Petitioner was also one of the assailants, who brutally assaulted complainant. Somehow, due to divine intervention, he (complainant) survived the attack. Based on the aforesaid complaint and medico-legal report, aforesaid FIR was registered.

It further emerges from the documents on record that the petitioner was declared 'Proclaimed offender' not once but twice vide orders dated 30.09.2021 and 10.01.2025. He was arrested on 30.04.2025. His application for



grant of bail was dismissed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Faridabad vide detailed order dated 28.08.2025. Aggrieved of which present petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner who has not been named in the FIR has been falsely implicated in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of one of co-accused. Unexplained delay of 07 days in lodging the FIR also raises serious question mark on the genuineness of story put-forth by the prosecution. Further, the falsity of the case set up by the prosecution is apparent from the fact that one of the prosecution witnesses also did not support the case of the prosecution. It is also the contention of learned counsel that co-accused similarly situated as the present petitioner has since been granted the concession of bail by this Court. Thus, similar treatment be meted out to petitioner who has been in custody since 30.04.2025, as his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, for, likelihood of completion of trial in near future is quite remote.

4. Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of bail, learned State counsel contends that the petitioner does not deserve leniency as he has been consistently disobeying the orders of the Court. He was declared proclaimed offender twice, vide orders dated 30.09.2021 and 10.01.2025. If extended the concession of bail, likelihood of him (P) fleeing from the process of justice as also tampering with the evidence cannot be ruled out. He, thus prays for dismissal of the petition.

5. Vide order dated 28.08.2025, it has already been noticed by the learned trial Court that the petitioner is a habitual offender as two other cases are stated to be pending against him. Besides this, he had been declared Proclaimed Offender, twice in the present case vide orders dated 30.09.2021 and 10.01.2025,

which itself reveals the conduct of the petitioner post FIR.



Though the petitioner is in custody since 30.04.2025 in the present case but this Court cannot ignore the fact that he kept concealing himself and had to be declared proclaimed offender twice.

Having regard to all the above facts and circumstances and taking note of the conduct of the petitioner, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court finds the present petition to be bereft of any merit.

Dismissed.

All pending misc. application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

04.02.2026
manoj

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No