



CRM-M-42620-2024

-1-

203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42620-2024
Decided on : 13.09.2024

Manvir Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG, Haryana.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. This is the petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.15 dated 02.02.2024 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 180 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Satnali District Mahendergarh.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.07.2024 in a Magisterial trial and there is no possibility of the trial concluding in the near future as charges have not yet been framed coupled with the fact that as many as 23 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution.
3. It has been further submitted that it is a case of false implication and in fact, the money was transferred into the bank



CRM-M-42620-2024

-2-

accounts of the accused Manoj and his wife, with no money being transferred into the account of the petitioner. It has also been submitted that the alleged racket wherein co-accused had been procuring false house loan was not being run by the petitioner but by the co-accused Manoj, with whom the petitioner is not remotely related or connected. It has also been asserted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and it is the first time that he has been involved in a criminal case.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not disputed that the prime accused in the present case is co-accused Manoj, who is still in custody. It has also not been disputed that there was no bank transaction between the petitioner and the alleged victims. However, learned State counsel has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, and has submitted that the petitioner connived with the main beneficiaries in the present scam running into crores of rupees.

5. On a pointed query put to the State counsel, he has not disputed the stage of trial and also the custody period of the petitioner. The factum of the petitioner of not being booked in any other criminal case is also not disputed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.



CRM-M-42620-2024

-3-

7. The petitioner has been in custody since 26.07.2024 in a Magisterial trial. The investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented. The trial has not progressed as charges are yet to be framed. Hence, it would take a considerable time for the trial to conclude as 24 prosecution witnesses have been cited.
8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
9. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.09.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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