



CRM-M-14314-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-14314-2025
Decided on : 04.08.2025

AJIT ALIAS CHOTTI

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Abhishek Sindhwani, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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
Ajit @ Chotti, aged about 35 years	449	14.10.2021	395 (deleted later on) and 392, 397 (added later on), IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959	Jind Sadar	Jind

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the petitioner is not mentioned in the FIR and his arrest on 21.02.2022 was



solely based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Deepak Goyal @ Baniya, wherein the petitioner's name emerged.

3. It is further submitted that co-accused namely Deepak Goyal has already been granted bail by this Court, vide order dated 16.02.2023 passed in CRM-M-43297-2022 (Annexure P-5). Similarly, another co-accused, Makhan, who was similarly situated as Deepak Goyal @ Baniya, has also been granted bail, vide order dated 29.08.2022 passed in CRM-M-27185-2022 (Annexure P-4).

4. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that despite petitioner being in custody for a period of more than three years and five months, complainant has not yet been examined. Moreover, recovery in the case has already been made from unknown accused persons, who had snatched a bag from a salesman working at the petrol pump.

5. It is further submitted that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only nine have been examined so far, indicating that trial is progressing at a slow pace. Lastly, counsel points out that in the other criminal cases in which petitioner has been made accused, bail has already been granted to him in one of those cases. Thus, he prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 03.08.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.



As per the custody certificate, petitioner has already undergone a period of 3 years, 5 months, and 19 days inside jail in the present case, and there are other cases also, which are registered against the petitioner, and in one of these cases, he has been granted bail by the court. However, petitioner has been convicted in five other cases.

7. Learned State counsel is unable to dispute the factual assertion made by counsel for the petitioner today before this Court. However, he vehemently opposes the prayer of regular bail made by the petitioner in the present case.

8. This Court has carefully considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it, and finds that petitioner has remained in custody for a considerable period of 3 years, 5 months, and 19 days, despite the fact that complete set of prosecution witnesses has yet to be examined. Thus, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

9. 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.

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



11. 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.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

04.08.2025

Lavisha

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