

CRM-M-24310-2025

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

CRM-M-24310-2025  
Reserved on: 09.07.2025  
Pronounced on: 31.07.2025

Mohit alias Maya ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen K. Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
431	11.09.2023	City Gohana, District Sonipat	398, 34 IPC and 25 of Arms Act

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. Per paragraph 15 of the bail petition, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	87	16.03.2021	386, 307, 353, 34 IPC and 25/29/54/59 of Arms Act	Sadar Gohana
2	108	23.02.2021	307, 120B, 34, 379B, 397, 394 IPC	City Rohtak
3	325	13.09.2023	392, 397, 379-B, 411, 34 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act	Urban Estate, Rohtak
4	239	17.04.2018	302/411/120B/34 IPC	Sadar Bahadurgarh, Jhajjar
5	238	06.09.2023	379 IPC	Civil Line, Rohtak
6	273	25.06.2016	380/454 IPC	Sampla, Rohtak
7	17332	2018	379/411 IPC	North West, Delhi
8	50	2021	341/379-B/392 IPC	Sadar, Gohana

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

CRM-M-24310-2025

*“2. That the instant FIR came into being on the basis of complaint made by complainant Rishab Jain son of Shri Parveen Jain, stating therein that they are running a jewelery shop under the name and style of K. Rattan Jewelers near Old Grain Market in front of Girls School, Sonipat, where he along with his father used to sit. He further stated that today i.e. on 11.09.2023, at about 3.45 p.m., he was showing jewelry to two female customers. In the meantime, two young boys having muffled faces had entered in their shop and asked him to show the jewelry. In the meantime, both the said boys took out pistols and threatened the complainant to hand over everything, whatever he was having and then, one boy immediately jumped over the counter and came towards the strongbox/Tijori and second boy stood towards the gate. In the meantime, father of complainant came inside the shop from outside and on seeing him coming, the said boys ran outside the shop, where their third accomplice was standing on the bike. Thereafter, all the three culprits fled away from The spot on their bike. The complainant further stated that when they checked the CCTV footage of their shop, the bike on which the culprits had run away, was found bearing registration No.HR-12S-6009. That the said boys had entered into their shop with an intention to commit robbery. With these allegations, the complainant sought for legal action against the miscreants. On receipt of above information, instant FIR was registered and investigation was set into motion.”*

4. Petitioner seeks bail on parity with co-accused Shantanu, who was granted bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.10.2024 passed in CRM-M-51854-2024.

5. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

REASONING:

7. Petitioner is not entitled to bail as when the co-accused Shantanu was granted bail, he has undergone 07 months of custody and the present petitioner's custody is only 07 days. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to bail.

8. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for bail. The impact of crime would not justify bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

CRM-M-24310-2025

9. The petitioner's custody of around 07 days cannot be termed prolonged, given the minimum sentence prescribed for the offense.

10. Regarding the delay in the trial, if the trial does not conclude within one year of the petitioner's custody, and the delay is not attributable to the petitioner, the petitioner may apply for bail before the trial Court. The Court shall not be influenced by the dismissal of bail on merits or by the criminal history and shall decide it on changed circumstances and the prolonged trial.

11. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

12. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

31.07.2025  
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.