



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

227

CRM-M-42591-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.09.2026

Sahil

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition preferred under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'the BNSS') is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.635, dated 24.07.2025 registered at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'the BNS').

2. On the complaint of one Sunil Kumar, the FIR in question was registered. Sunil Kumar had obtained a gold loan from Manipuram Gold Loan and had pledged his gold jewellery weighing 19 tolas. Accordingly, a loan of Rs.8,92,454/- was disbursed to him. Upon repayment of the loan, when the jewellery was handed back to the complainant, he found the weight of the kada (bangle) to be slightly more than it actually was. Accordingly, he got it tested from a jeweller and found that the Kada (bangle) was made of brass. An enquiry was conducted and it was found that one Rajeshwar Mahboob Yalgar, Branch Manager of the Manipuram Gold Loan along with another employee Raju had approached the jeweller Deepak Bhola and had asked him to prepare a replica of the said Kada. The name of the petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement of Rajeshwar Mahboob Yalgar and he was accordingly arrested on 20.05.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He submits that initially only the branch manager of Manipuram Gold Loan and one Raju were apprehended and they are still in custody being the main accused and the petitioner was arrested only on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by them. He submits that though the petitioner is an employee of Manipuram Gold Loan, he has absolutely no role to play in the matter. He submits that the antecedents of the petitioner are clean; he is in custody for the last more than 3 months, he having been arrested on 20.05.2026; no recovery has to be made from him; investigation stands completed; final report has been submitted; however, charges are yet to be framed. He submits that under the circumstances, trial will take a sufficiently long time, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application, stating that the allegations against the petitioner are very serious and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may try to influence and threaten the witnesses and may also abscond.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. As to whether the petitioner was actually involved in the offence or not shall be determined when the trial concludes. The petitioner was named on the basis of a disclosure statement made by the main accused Rajeshwar Mahboob Yalgar and Raju. No recovery is to be made from him. His antecedents are clean. He is in custody for the last 3 months and 12 days. Investigation stands completed. Final report has been submitted though charges are yet to be framed. It is, therefore, clear that trial will take a

sufficiently long time and in the considered opinion of this Court, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

7. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

September 03, 2026

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No