

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:022807



224

CRM-M-59757-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:13.02.2026

Rampal @ Monu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Kapil Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.113, dated 20.05.2020, registered under Sections 387 and 506 IPC (offence under Sections 120-B, 201 and 204 IPC were added lateron), at Police Station City Safidon, District Jind.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant – Satish Jain on 20.05.2020, alleging that on the same day, he had received some threatening messages and messages making demand of ransom money to the tune of Rs.2 crores and otherwise threatening to kill him.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were

initiated. During the course of investigation, accused Suresh @ Chhota and Dinesh were arrested. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime and their complicity with accused Jogender Gyong, who was running a racket for extorting money from rich businessmen. Accused Dinesh disclosed that accused Suresh @ Chhota provided phone number and other details of the complainant to accused Jogender Gyong and then he had made exhortation call to the victim. Accused Jogender Gyong was in custody in some other case. His presence was secured in this case through production warrants and he was arrested on 13.02.2025. Accused Jogender Gyong also suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and on the basis of the same, the present petitioner was nominated as accused. Petitioner was also in custody in some other case and was arrested in this case on 10.03.2025. He too suffered disclosure statement, as per which he had done *reccee* of the victim and had given information qua him to accused Jogender Gyong so that he could extort money from the complainant. Investigation now stands concluded and the petitioner along with co-accused is facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. There is no material on record to connect him with the subject offences. Even the complainant, who has since been examined, has not deposed anything against him. No recovery is to be effected from him. His continued detention would not serve any useful

purpose. The trial will obviously take considerable time to conclude since only 03 out of 20 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Co-accused Suresh @ Chhota and Dinesh, against whom specific allegations have been levelled, have since been acquitted by the trial Court. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. It is, therefore, argued that the petitioner deserves to be extended the benefit of bail.

5. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender, being involved in 05 more cases, out of which, one is a murder case. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, stressed that he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioner is in custody since 10.03.2025. He is not required for further investigation. He was not named in the FIR and has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. On account of his involvement in other case alone, he cannot be denied benefit of bail. The trial will obviously take time to conclude. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception and pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing. The object of jail is to secure appearance of the accused during trial and it cannot be punitive or preventive. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner may abscond or commit similar offences.

8. In view of the discussion as made above, this Court is of the

considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner on bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds as well as surety bonds by two sureties in the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned. The petitioner shall, however, keep the trial Court informed about any change in his residential address and his mobile number. He will keep his mobile phone active round the clock. He will also remain present before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing, failing which it shall be taken as misuse of the concession of bail. Similarly, if the petitioner is found involved in any other case of similar nature, that will amount to misuse of concession of bail and in that event, it shall be open to the State to apply for cancellation of bail without further reference to this Court.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

10. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

13.02.2026

harjeet

**(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No