

2026:PHHC:022063



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

224

CRM-M-67347-2025

Date of Decision: 12.02.2026

NARENDER

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Rupender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.09 dated 04.01.2025 under Sections 115(2), 140(2), 308(4) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 (Section 25(6)-54-59 of Arms Act, 1959 added later on) registered at Police Station Sadar Karnal, District Karnal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner kidnapped the son of the complainant and demanded a ransom of Rs.2 crores. It is also stated that the petitioner is serving in Haryana Police.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been facing trial before the trial Court and out of 22 prosecution witnesses only 03 have been examined till date. He further contends that these three witnesses include the complainant and the victim as well and none of them has supported the case of the prosecution. It is also contended that the petitioner is involved in one more case under Section 307 of IPC, however, he is on bail in that case. He further contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 01 month and 03 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations

and role attributed to the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are serious. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 01 month and 03 days.

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

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 01 month and 03 days, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. 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/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 12, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No