

CNR No. HRFB01-012069 of 2026. CIS No. BA 7309 of 2026.
Mool Chand Vs. State of Haryana.

1

IN THE COURT OF SURENDER KUMAR, ADDITIONAL
SESSIONS JUDGE, FARIDABAD
(UID No. HR0207).

HRFB010120692026



Presented on : 19-08-2026
Registered on : 19-08-2026
Decided on : 24-08-2026
Duration : 0 year, 0 month, 5 days

Mool Chand @ Malua @ Ramnath son of Shri Harcharan, age 28 years,
r/o village Chauka Chhatarpur, Madhya Pradesh at present tenant of
Mangal, R/o Village Etmadpur, Sector-31, Fariabad.

.....Applicant-Accused

Versus

State of Haryana.

.....Respondent

FIR No.171 dated 26.08.2025
Police Station:Sector-31, Faridabad
U/S:- 331(3), 305-A, 3(5), 317(2), 112 of BNS

**Second Regular Bail Application u/s 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.**

Argued by: Shri C.S. Bhankar, Advocate for the applicant-accused.
Shri Mahesh Kumar, Public Prosecutor for the State.

ORDER:-

This order shall dispose of the instant second application for
regular bail under section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita,
2023, moved on behalf of applicant-accused Mool Chand, in the above-

Surender Kumar
ASJ, Faridabad
Dt.24.08.2026.

noted case. First bail application of the applicant-accused was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 15.01.2026. Notice of the bail application was issued to the respondent-State of Haryana and the reply has been filed.

2. As per police reply, on 26.08.2025, complainant K.O. Iyeviyer son of K.V. Osef, R/o House no.285, Sector-28, Faridabad met with ASI Ajruddin and presented an application alleging therein that he was posted as DGM in Indian Oil, Sector-13, Faridabad and his wife is a school teacher in TIJI school. On that day, his wife had left for her duty at about 07.00 a.m. and his daughter also left for her school at about 07.20 a.m. Complainant also left for his job at about 09.00 a.m. after locking his house. When the wife of complainant came back at their house at about 02.00 p.m., then the lock of the house was found broken. On checking the house, lock of almirah kept in the house was also found broken and the house-hold articles were found lying scattered. On checking, one gold necklace alongwith ear-rings 3 tolas, one gold chain 2 tolas, 15 gold bangles 20 tolas, one gold chain 5 tolas, seven gold rings 7 tolas, one pair of ear-ring 5 tolas, one gold mala 2 tolas, one diamond pendent, one gold chain, ring and ear-ring of his daughter 4 tolas, one gold chain 16 grams and DVR of CCTV footage were found missing. A penal action was prayed for against the culprits.

3. On the basis of application, the aforesaid case FIR was

registered and investigation was set into motion. The applicant-accused was arrested on 07.09.2025 who suffered disclosure statement regarding his involvement in the present case. The applicant-accused got recovered DVR and *chhainni* used in the occurrence for breaking the lock. The applicant-accused also got recovered the stolen ornaments. Investigation has been completed and final report has been presented before the court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant-accused, as well as learned Public Prosecutor for the State and perused the records.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant-accused Mool Chand has contended that the applicant-accused has been falsely implicated in the present case as he has no concern with the allegations levelled in the case FIR. The applicant-accused is not named in the FIR. The investigation qua applicant-accused has been completed and final report has been presented before the court on 06.11.2025. All the offences are triable by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class. The applicant-accused is in custody since 07.09.2025. It has further been argued that first bail application of the applicant-accused was dismissed by this court vide order dated 15.01.2026 but now there is material change in circumstances as complainant and his wife have been examined in the present case and custody period of the applicant-accused has also increased.

It has also been argued that applicant-accused has been shown to be involved in 26 other criminal cases but applicant-accused is

on bail in most of the cases and he is in custody in only four cases out of 26 cases. It has further been argued that involvement of applicant-accused in other criminal cases is not a ground to decline bail application in the present case as he is in custody in the case in hand since 07.09.2025. The subsequent trial of the case would take long time, therefore, no purpose would be served by further detaining the applicant-accused in judicial custody. With these submissions, it has been prayed that applicant-accused be granted concession of regular bail.

6. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor for the State has opposed the present bail application on the ground that the present applicant-accused has committed the grave and serious offence. The applicant-accused got recovered the stolen ornaments in pursuance of his disclosure statement which were taken in possession vide recovery memo dated 10.09.2025. It has been further argued that applicant-accused is a habitual offender and 26 more cases of similar nature are already registered against him. Therefore, keeping in view the gravity of offence, applicant-accused is not entitled to concession of regular bail.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant-accused, as well as learned Public Prosecutor for the State and going through the records, it is noticed that allegations levelled against present applicant-accused Mool Chand are that he had committed theft in the house of complainant of ornaments, i.e., one gold necklace alongwith ear-rings 3

tolas, one gold chain 2 tolas, 15 gold bangles 20 tolas, one gold chain 5 tolas, seven gold rings 7 tolas, one pair of ear-ring 5 tolas, one gold mala 2 tolas, one diamond pendent, one gold chain, ring and ear-ring of his daughter 4 tolas, one gold chain 16 grams and DVR of CCTV footage. He also got recovered one DVR and *chhaini* on 07.09.2025. The applicant-accused has also got recovered the stolen ornaments. Therefore, allegations levelled against the applicant-accused are grave and serious. First bail application of the applicant-accused was dismissed by this court vide order dated 15.01.2026.

8. A perusal of the police reply shows that applicant-accused is a habitual offender as 26 other criminal cases of similar nature are already registered against him. Ld. counsel for the applicant-accused has himself admitted that applicant-accused is in custody in four criminal cases out of 26 criminal cases, as detailed in the police reply. A perusal of police reply also shows that five FIRs out of 26 cases against applicant-accused were registered in the year 2025 besides the present case FIR. Therefore, conduct of applicant-accused clearly shows that he is a habitual offender and if he is granted bail, he may misuse the concession of regular bail and indulge in similar kind of other cases.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the present case as well as act and conduct of applicant-accused and without commenting upon merits of the case, the applicant-accused Mool Chand

CNR No. HRFB01-012069 of 2026. CIS No. BA 7309 of 2026.
Mool Chand Vs. State of Haryana.

6

is not entitled for concession of regular bail. Hence, present regular bail application moved on behalf of applicant-accused Mool Chand is hereby dismissed. File be consigned to the record room.

Pronounced in open Court.
Dated: 24.08.2026

(Surender Kumar),
Addl.Sessions Judge
Faridabad.(UID No.HR0207)

Note:- Certified that this order contains six pages, which have been checked and signed by me.

(Surender Kumar),
Addl.Sessions Judge
Faridabad.(UID No.HR0207)
24.08.2026

Veena Madhan, SG-1