



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

257

CRM-M-830 of 2026
Decided on : 06.02.2026

Bhajan Lal . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant third petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Bhajan Lal	421	23.11.2025	305, 331(3), 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Civil Lines, Hisar	Hisar

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on behalf of the victim – Nand Lal Chhabra, a complaint was submitted to the police on 15.11.2025 by the authorized person, namely Bhajan Lal, who is none else but the present petitioner. In the said complaint, it was alleged that an amount of Rs.60,00,000/- had been stolen from the house of the retired professor, namely, Nand Lal Chhabra son of Guraya Ram, resident of H.No.15, Green Park Colony, Hisar. Consequently, GD No.43 dated 15.11.2025 was recorded and after conducting preliminary inquiry, the present FIR was



registered initially against one Kalu. However, subsequently, the petitioner was also arrayed as an accused in the case on the allegation that the said Kalu had been employed in the house of the victim at the instance of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is neither the beneficiary of the alleged stolen amount nor was he directly involved in the commission of theft in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner is inside jail since 26.11.2025 and after completion of investigation, challan has also been presented before the competent Court. It is further pointed out that recovery of the amount has been effected from one Suresh, who is not even made an accused in the present case, though he happens to be related to the petitioner as his cousin. Learned counsel, therefore, submits that the offence is triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Accordingly, prayer has been made for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the total amount alleged to have been stolen is around Rs.80,00,000/- and not Rs.60,00,000/-. He further submits that looking at the alleged involvement of the petitioner through his cousin Suresh, he is not entitled to the concession of bail, though it is admitted that after completion of investigation, challan has already been submitted. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual assertions made here-above in the foregoing paragraphs.

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



the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

6. Admittedly, an amount of Rs.60,00,000/- has already been recovered. However, it is yet to be adjudicated whether the petitioner had any actual involvement in the commission of the alleged offence, as no recovery has been effected either from his possession or at his instance. No specific clarification has been furnished by the State as to the source of the recovered amount or as to how the said amount came to be in possession of the victim, namely the retired Professor – Nand Lal Chhabra. Besides, the offence in question is triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and the petitioner is not shown to be involved in any other criminal case. In these circumstances, continued incarceration of the petitioner for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose.

7. In view of the totality of the circumstances, and without commenting upon the merits of the case lest it may prejudice either side during trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not



be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 06, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*