



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36742-2026

Akashdeep
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	22.07.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.07.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.07.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or 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. Vimal Kumar Gupta, Advocate with
Ms. Palkin Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Ashish Grewal, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 183 dated 05.05.2026 registered under Sections 306, 316(4), 318(4) and 61(2) of BNS at Police Station Sadar Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant-Navdeep Dhingra, Proprietor of M/s Oscar Remedies Firm, alleging therein that the present petitioner was appointed as Accountant in his firm on 11.01.2025. He used to do the entire accounting work of the firm and also looked after its banking transactions. He had gained the trust of the complainant. By gaining the complainant's trust, he used to procure blank signed cheques from the complainant for the purpose of making payments to different companies with which the firm of the complainant had business transactions through RTGS. The complainant alleged that by misleading the complainant and with an intention to cheat him, the petitioner started procuring the complainant's signatures on certain cheques, which were shown to be realized by "Yourself", i.e. the complainant himself and those very cheques were then used by the petitioner for withdrawing money and transferring the same to the bank account of his wife or other acquaintances. He used to obtain the complainant's signatures on such cheques while simultaneously procuring signatures on other cheques issued for making payments to different companies. The petitioner also started making cuttings in the list which was prepared in the ordinary course of business for issuance of such cheques. It was further alleged that his wife and one Sunil Kumar, a friend of the petitioner, were also conniving with him and actively participating in these transactions. In this manner, the petitioner caused wrongful loss of approximately to the tune of ₹1,59,63,943 to the complainant's firm and embezzled the said amount. When confronted, he



admitted his guilt and deposited a sum of ₹43,13,890 in the account of the firm. He also promised to transfer two properties which he had allegedly purchased out of the misappropriated money. However, thereafter, he absconded after locking his house.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the petitioner was interrogated and suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the present crime and that he had misappropriated a total amount of ₹1,67,60,220. He deposited a sum of ₹59,08,132 in the account of the firm and also transferred a plot in its favour. Some gold ornaments belonging to his wife were also handed over to the complainant firm. During the course of investigation, the other persons named in the FIR were found innocent and were exonerated. He was arrested on 25.05.2026. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that no *prima facie* case is made out against him since as per the admission of the complainant himself, even prior to the registration of the FIR, the complainant had received a sum of ₹43,13,890 from the petitioner. The petitioner had also transferred a residential house measuring 75 square yards and a plot measuring 100 square yards in favour of the complainant by executing two registered sale deeds. He had also handed over his motor vehicle, gold ornaments, and an FDR worth ₹10,00,000. As such, the complainant has received money, plots/properties, ornaments, and other assets having worth of about ₹1.5 crore from the petitioner. He is not required for further



investigation. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. His further incarceration would serve no useful purpose. It is, thus, argued that the present petition be allowed.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has vehemently opposed the petition and argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is submitted that the petitioner caused a wrongful loss of more than ₹1.60 crore to the complainant by deceitfully transferring different amounts from the bank account of the complainant's firm and, by misusing the trust reposed in him criminally misappropriated the same. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing similar offences, if extended the benefit of bail. It is further argued that the plots transferred in the name of the complainant by the petitioner are having worth of ₹10,00,000/- and ₹26,00,000/- only and still a substantial amount of the misappropriated money still remains to be paid by the petitioner. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed..

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner has been in custody since 25.05.2026. Investigation now stands concluded. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, as even the charges have not yet been framed. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. Further incarceration of the petitioner is not going to serve any fruitful purpose. It is well settled proposition of law



that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing and that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. The object of jail is to secure the appearance of the accused during the trial and it can neither be punitive nor preventive and the deprivation of liberty has been considered as a punishment. In view of the discussion made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore and he has made out a case for his release on bail. Accordingly, the 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/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

23rd July, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |