



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34470-2026 (O&M)

AMRIK SINGH @ AMRIKA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondents

1	The date when the judgment is reserved	21.08.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	24.08.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	24.08.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment and reasons thereof.	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Manmeet Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the second petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short “BNSS”) for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.07 dated 03.01.2024 registered under Section 379 of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added later on) at Police Station City Kaithal, District Kaithal. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-7552-2026 was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 21.04.2026.



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant-Ankur Kansal, alleging therein that on the night of 02.01.2024, he had parked his Swift car bearing registration No.HR08R-4964 in front of his house and in the next morning, the same was found to be stolen.After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The CCTV camera footage of the vicinity was procured, and one unknown person was found stealing the vehicle. On the basis of a secret information, accused Dimple Kapoor Honey was apprehended. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement, on the basis of which the accused Harpreet alias Ghanta, Neeraj alias Shishu, and Girjashankar alias Bobbywere nominated as additional accused. They were also arrested. On interrogation, they admitted their involvement in the crime and disclosed that they had sold the stolen vehicle to the present petitioner for a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/-.The petitioner was nominated as accused. He was arrested on 20.09.2025. On interrogation, he disclosed that he had sold the parts of the stolen vehicles to different customers for a sum of Rs.1,30,000/-. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that after dismissal of his previous petition, a period of more than four months has expired. He is not required for further investigation. Challan stands presented. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. Each day spent by him in custody has furnished a new reason to him to seek concession of bail. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. His continued detention would not



serve any useful purpose. He cannot be kept in jail for indefinite time only because of the fact that he is involved in other cases. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He has remained involved in similar offences since long, and as many as 25 cases have been registered against him. There are chances of his committing similar offenses again if extended benefit of bail. It is hence stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by the parties.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have received stolen vehicle and then sold its parts to different persons. He has been in custody since 20.09.2025. The trial will obviously take time to conclude. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be sole reason for denying benefit of bail to him. Taking into consideration the period spent by the petitioner in custody, the nature of the subject offence, and the attendant facts and circumstances, but without meaning to make any comment on the merit of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.



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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

24.08.2026
Amit Sharma

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