



249

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

CRM-M-13157-2025

Date of Decision:08.04.2025

SUSHIL KUMAR BABAL

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

**Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

Present : Mr. K.S. Godara, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S., with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.833 dated 21.12.2024, registered under Sections 308(2), 308(4), 308(6), 351(2), 111(3), 396, 61(2), 3(5) of B.N.S., Police Station City Sirsa, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, the petitioner received a call on his mobile phone from Vinod Godara from Canada and he gave his phone to complainant for talking to Vinod Godara. He further contends that neither the petitioner nor Vinod Godara were having any criminal background and the entire story has been cooked up by the complainant in the present case. He further



contends that even the other co-accused Dr. Sanjeev Kaushal is not having any criminal record. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 21.12.2024 and challan has already been presented against him.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 21.12.2024 and is in custody for the last about 04 months. Even challan has already been presented against the petitioner. However, no prosecution witness has been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time. Moreover, the prosecution has not been able to produce any material to show that the petitioner is in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution. Thus, further custody of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

**08.04.2025**  
*vipin*

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

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