



254+378

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

CRM-M-30029-2025

Date of Decision:20.08.2025

Bhupender Singh @ Pinda

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

(ii)

CRM-M-35399-2025

Sukhvinder Singh @ Sukha

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-30029-2025.

Mr. Partap Singh, Advocate with
Mr. Manav Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Vikas Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-35399-2025.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off two bail petitions i.e CRM-M-30029-2025 titled as "***Bhupender Singh @ Pinda Vs. State of Haryana***" and CRM-M-35399-2025 titled as "***Sukhvinder Singh @ Sukha Vs. State of Haryana***", whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case arising out of FIR No.53, dated 13.02.2020, registered under Sections 380,457,511 of IPC, Sections 307,382,201 of IPC and 25 of Arms Act added later on, Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioners have vehemently argued that in the present case the FIR was initially registered against unknown persons and there is no averment in the FIR, which even remotely connect the petitioners with the commission of crime, in any manner. He next contends that after registration of the FIR on 13.02.2020, the matter was investigated and an untrace report was prepared by the police on 05.07.2021. However, later on, the petitioners were arrested in one more FIR No.304 and were also arrested in the present case on 08.09.2023. Thus, the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 01 year and 11 months. Learned counsel next contends that even though five more cases were ordered to be registered against the petitioners, but the petitioners are on bail in the said cases. He next contends that only 02 witnesses out of total 18 witnesses have been examined so far and the custody of the petitioners will not serve any meaningful purpose.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on the ground that the petitioners are habitual offenders and does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. It is an admitted fact that the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 01 year and 11 months and the prosecution has been able to examine only 02 witnesses out of total 18 witnesses so far. Thus, there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial in the present case.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present



petition(s) are allowed. The petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail pending trial on their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade them to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

(ii) The petitioners shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.

(iii) The petitioners shall not absent themselves from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioners shall surrender their passport, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case they are not holder of the same, they shall swear an affidavit to that effect.

(v) The petitioners shall also file their affidavits before the concerned Court, mentioning their ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by them during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, they shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.

(vi) In case, the petitioners are involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.

(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two heavy local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioners.

7. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him



shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

20.08.2025

hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

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