

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

CRM-M-2626-2026 (O&M)

ARUN VERMA @ JEEWAN KUMAR @ RAJESH VERMA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

1	The date when the judgment is reserved	20.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment and reasons thereof.	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. M.N. Jajoria, Advocate and
Ms. Lavanya Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab

MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNSS") for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.111 dated 06.12.2014 registered under Sections 328, 457, 380 and 489 of IPC at Police Station Bakshiwal, District Patiala.



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant Ranjit Singh alleging that on the evening of 09.11.2014, the petitioner-Arun Verma who was got acquainted with the complainant through his relative Gurcharan Singh only 01 year back, alongwith his wife and 02 daughters came to his house. They had supper with them and thereafter wished to drink milk. The mother of the complainant started going to kitchen to give warm milk to the petitioner and his family but the accused Seema Verma insisted that she herself would make the milk warm and bring it. Thereafter, all of them had taken milk brought by Seema Verma and had gone to sleep. On the next morning, on waking up, the complainant and his family members found that the locks of the trunk were lying broken and all the belongings of his house were found scattered. By alleging that by mixing some intoxicating substance in the milk given to them with intent to commit the offence of theft, robbery in his house, the petitioner and the co-accused had made them unconscious and had stolen cash amount of Rs.22,000/-, some dollars and gold ornaments kept in the house.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and his wife were arrested on 22.12.2014. One gold bangle, 02 gold topus, 02 rings and Rs.10,000/- and 200 Australian dollars pertaining to the complainant were recovered at the instance of the petitioner. The petitioner was extended benefit of bail. During trial, he absented himself due to which his bail was cancelled on 06.11.2015 and bonds were forfeited to the State. He was declared a proclaimed person. He was subsequently arrested on 04.07.2025.



4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for a period of 01 year now. The trial will take time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. His absence was not intentional. His implication in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is an absconder and remained absconded for a period of about 10 years. The trial has concluded as all the prosecution witnesses have been examined and the case is at the stage of producing defence evidence. As such, there are no chances of delay in conclusion of the trial. Rather there are chances of petitioner's absconding again, if extended benefit of bail. His antecedents are also not clean. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner alongwith the co-accused who is his wife is alleged to have administered some intoxicating substance to the complainant and his other family members on the fateful night of 09.11.2014 with intent to commit the offence of theft and in pursuance thereof, is alleged to have stolen valuable articles and money from the house of the complainant. The petitioner remained absconding for a period of about 10 years. He had been arrested only on 04.07.2025. The trial has almost concluded now and as such it cannot be stated



that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Taking into consideration the act and conduct of the petitioner, his involvement in other cases including case registered under the provisions of Section 174A of IPC and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

23.03.2026
Amit Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No