



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

CRM-M-73594-2025

Date of decision: 18.03.2026

SUMIT

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. B.S. Beniwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J (Oral):

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.0374 dated 23.09.2025 registered under Sections 126, 127(7) and 309(6) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Agroha, District Hisar Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 23.09.2025, petitioner along with co-accused suddenly arrived on a motorcycle. They abducted the complainant into a room, physically assaulted him and snatched Rs.14700/- from him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. No weapon has been recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that he is not involved in any other case and has been in custody since 05 months and 21 days.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. He further submits that as per the custody certificate, the



petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and 21 days and out of a total of 08 prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined.

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

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that apart from the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the commission of crime; he is in custody for the last 05 months and 21 days; out of a total of 08 prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined; the trial is yet to commence and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, ‘bail is rule and jail is exception’.

7. 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 bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

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

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2026
monika

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
2. Whether reportable : Yes /No