



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

222

**CRM-M No.60153 of 2024
Date of decision: 28.01.2025**

SAHIL**.... Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA****.... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present : Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, D.A.G., Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short-‘BNSS’) by the petitioner for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.722 dated 29.12.2021 registered under Sections 148, 201, 323, 325, 365, 367, 379-B, 395, 397 and 506 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Rai, District Sonipat.

2. Record reveals that the petitioner had been extended benefit of bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 09.05.2022. He absented himself on 11.10.2024 due to which his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. Thereafter, he has surrendered before the learned trial Court on 06.11.2024 and is in custody since then. He had moved an application for grant of regular bail before the learned trial Court which had been dismissed vide order dated 11.11.2024.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner could not appear before the learned trial Court on 11.10.2024 due to sickness of his mother. His absence was not intentional but was *bona fide*. He did not



CRM-M No.60153 of 2024

-2-

misuse the concession of bail previously granted to him. He is ready to join the proceedings before the learned trial Court and to abide by the terms and conditions to be imposed upon him.

4. Learned State counsel has orally resisted the prayer made by the petitioner by submitting that there are chances of his absconding, if he is extended benefit of regular bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. In view of the explanation given by the petitioner for his non appearance on 11.10.2024, but without commenting on the merit of the present case, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be extended benefit of regular bail. Hence the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

6. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

28.01.2025
Jyoti-IV

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