



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

123+213

CRM-M-19893-2026 (O&M)

Decided on : 23.04.2026

SUNNY

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

CRM-17512-2026

1. Present application has been moved by the applicant/petitioner for placing on record order dated 20.05.2024 passed by Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Hisar, as Annexure P-5.

2. Considering the averments mentioned in the application, prayer made in the application is allowed and order dated 20.05.2024 is ordered to be taken on record as Annexure P-5. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

3. CM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-19893-2026

1. The instant 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 hereunder:-



Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sunny, aged about 31 years	226	09.05.2024	454, 380, 411 of IPC (331(3), 305, 317(2) of BNS)	City Hisar	Hisar

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the allegations, an amount of Rs.2 lakhs was stolen from the shop of the complainant by some unknown persons. During the course of investigation, one accused, Vikas @ Bakra, was apprehended, from whom a sum of Rs.1.31 lacs of the stolen amount was recovered. During interrogation, he disclosed the name of present petitioner, pursuant to which petitioner was also arrested in the case.

It is further submitted that petitioner, after remaining in custody for about seven days, was granted the concession of bail by the Court of learned JMIC, Hisar, vide order dated 20.05.2024 (Annexure P-5). At the time of his arrest, a sum of Rs.69,000/- was allegedly recovered from his possession.

3. Counsel further contends that although, petitioner absented himself from the Court on 10.11.2025, he subsequently surrendered before the Court on 04.02.2026 and has remained in custody, since then. It is also pointed out that co-accused, Vikas @ Bakra, from whose disclosure statement the petitioner's name surfaced, has already been granted the concession of bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, vide order dated 15.06.2024 (Annexure P-2).

It is thus argued that, for the lapse on his part, petitioner has already undergone a sufficient period of incarceration. Assuring that he



will not misuse the concession of bail in future, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel is unable to dispute any of the factual assertion as stated by counsel for the petitioner today before this Court. However, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

6. Admittedly, all the offences involved in the present case are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. After his surrender/re-arrest, petitioner has remained in custody for a period of approximately 2 months and 19 days. No useful or meaningful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for an indefinite period.

7. In view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of the allegations, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner in the present case.

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/ Illaqa 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.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO