



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

240

CRWP-13928-2025

Date of Decision:-21.04.2026

MOHAMMAD ASLAM**.....PETITIONER****VS.****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Gautam, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate, and
Mr. Aaftab Hasan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

1. The prayer in the present petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for the issuance of directions in the nature of habeas corpus and mandamus directing the official respondents to release/produce the petitioner from unlawful custody and protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and for a further issuance of a writ in the nature of quo-warranto directing the learned Illaqa Magistrate, Faridabad to explain non-compliance/non-adherence to notification No.159 Gaz.II (17) dated 22.09.2023 while passing various orders allowing police and judicial remand of the petitioner.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was arrested from Delhi but his arrest was shown from Faridabad. He was produced before the concerned Magistrate after 24 hours. No grounds of arrest were supplied to him. Therefore, he be directed to be released from custody and the Illaqa Magistrate be directed to explain his conduct in allowing police/judicial remand.

3. The learned counsel the State, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner has already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 25.03.2026. When the petitioner was produced before the concerned Magistrate and police/judicial remand was granted, he ought to have challenged the same before the Sessions Court, if so warranted. The instant petition is now infructuous once the petitioner has already been granted bail.

4. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner has been granted the concession of bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 25.03.2026. So his first prayer for seeking release from custody has been rendered infructuous. As regards the second prayer seeking the issuance of directions to the Magistrate to explain non-compliance/non-adherence to the notification No.159 Gaz.II (17) dated 22.09.2023, it would be relevant to mention here that when the petitioner was produced before the concerned Magistrate and police remand was granted, if aggrieved, he was at liberty to challenge the same before the appropriate Court. However, for reasons best known, he did not do so. Similarly, when he was remanded to judicial custody, he ought to have challenged the said order, which was once again not done.

6. In view of the above discussion, at this stage, once the petitioner has been granted bail, the present petition is nothing but an exercise in futility, and the same stands dismissed.

21.04.2026

Kusum

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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