

212 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55700-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 04.05.2023

TARUN KUMAR DUDEJA

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Sr. DAG Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case of FIR No.10 dated 02.05.2022, registered under Section 420 IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC added later on), at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months. His name has surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Nishant Sharma, who has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 13.09.2022 (Annexure P-3), wherein the complainant had made a statement of having received back the amount in question. The challan had been presented on 09.09.2022, however, the charges have not been framed. In all, there are 25 prosecution witnesses. Though the petitioner is involved in two more cases, however, he is on bail by the High Court of the respective States where the cases are registered. He relies on the judgment of Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner was involved with the co-accused Nishant in opening of various bank

accounts, wherein the transactions with many persons including the complainant had taken place. Further 6 rent agreements have also been recovered from him, which are in his name as also the co-accused Nishant. He is however, unable to controvert the submissions with regard to custody, stage of the case, petitioner is on bail in the other two cases and the co-accused Nishant has been granted regular bail.

4. Heard.

5. Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (*Supra*) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

6. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, observations made in the aforesaid judgment, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months; co-accused having been granted regular bail; though the challan had been presented on 09.09.2022, however, charges are yet to be framed; in all there are 25 prosecution witnesses; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, thus the present petition for grant of regular bail deserves to be allowed.

7. As a result, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case. The petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

1. The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
 2. The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
 3. The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
 4. The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
 5. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
 6. The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
 7. The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number to the Trial Court forthwith and shall not change the same till the conclusion of the trial and in case for any reason, the petitioner seeks to change any of the aforesaid, the same shall be done only with prior intimation to the learned Trial Court, stating the reason for the same.
 8. The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the Trial Court forthwith and in case, he does not have the passport, he shall furnish a specific affidavit in this regard.
8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.
9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

May 04, 2023
M.Kamra

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