



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

233

CRM-M-36817-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 20.08.2025

Surinder Pal

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. K.S. Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Praagbir S. Dhindsa, Advocate and
Mr. Kartik Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. PK Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Surinder Pal	33	11.03.2025	406, 409, 420, 120-B of IPC [S. 467, 468, 479 of IPC added later on]	Naggal	Ambala

2. By claiming parity, or rather, being on a better footing *vis-à-vis* the other two accused, namely; Rajinder Singh and Krishan Lal, in an application filed by the petitioner – Surender Pal, on 29.07.2025, while seeking pre-ponement of the date of hearing in the main case from 24.09.2025 to 20.08.2025, i.e., for today itself, the following order was passed:-



- “1. *Application i.e. CRM-28081-2025 has been moved by the applicant/petitioner, seeking preponement of the date of hearing in the main case i.e. CRM-M-36817-2025, from 24.09.2025 to any early date.*
2. *Learned Senior counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that the main accused namely Rajinder Singh and Krishan Lal have already been released on interim anticipatory bail, whereas petitioner against whom there is an allegation of embezzlement of an amount of Rs.34,000/-, is lying inside jail for the last about four and half months.*
3. *It is further submitted that the petitioner, who holds the position of Sarpanch, has been victimized at the time of registration of the case, with the apparent intent to malign his reputation and create grounds for his removal from office.*
4. *Notice in the application.*
5. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent/State, and Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.*
6. *Considering the submissions addressed by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, prayer made in the present application is allowed. Accordingly, hearing in the main petition i.e. CRM-M-36817-2025 is preponed from 24.09.2025, to 20.08.2025.*
7. *CM stands disposed of.”*

3. There is no dispute that the contention of the petitioner recorded in the order dated 29.07.2025 to the effect that, as per the allegations, the total embezzled amount attributed to the petitioner is Rs.35,724/- (in the previous order, the same was recorded as Rs.34,000/-), and that the petitioner has been in custody for a period of more than five months. It is further not in dispute that the final report has already been submitted. Besides, the offences are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate, and the co-accused have already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by the Hon’ble Apex Court. Thus, the petitioner prays for grant of concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he is unable to refute the factual assertions noted here-above.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.



6. Be that as it may, in such offences, which are triable by the Court of Magistrate, and where the other two accused, namely Rajinder Singh and Krishan Lal, have already been released on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period.

7. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here-above, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

8. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her 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.

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

10. The observation made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 20, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No