



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-31240-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.8.2024

Rajwinder Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Varun Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Surender Singh.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
0120	12.5.2023	City Pehowa, District Kurukshetra	406, 420 of Indian Penal Code, wherein offence under Section 120-B IPC was added later on

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Dinesh Tiwari, wherein it is alleged that his nephew Shubham had been residing in Spain since the year 2017. On 4.5.2023, he (complainant) received a telephone call and the caller while introducing himself as Shubham inquired about the well being of the members of the family and further requested the complainant to transfer some



amount as he was facing financial difficulty. It is further alleged that Shubham also mentioned that in case he is not able to overcome the financial crisis, he was considering ending his life. The complainant being moved by such representation initially transferred an amount of Rs.6 lakhs in State Bank of India Account No.4186092536 and later deposited further amount, total being more than Rs.28 lakhs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that there is no evidence worth credence to connect him with the alleged transfer of amount. It has further been submitted that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 11 months and as on date not even a single PW out of the cited 21 PWs has been examined.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that since the police has collected sufficient evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged fraud, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. It has, however, been informed that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and that as on date no PW out of the cited 21 PWs has been examined.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case but without commenting anything as regards the veracity of allegations against the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of bail particularly in view of the fact that the trial has not even commenced till date and the petitioner otherwise has a clean record.



CRM-M-31240-2024 (O&M) (3)

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

28.8.2024

Pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No