



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

CRM-M-52859-2024

Date of decision: 16.12.2024

RAMANDEEP SINGH

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

....RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. S.S. Jattan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

* * * * *

SANJIV BERRY, J.(ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under: -

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
282	14.09.2023	406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC and Section 201 of IPC.	Barara, District Ambala.

2. Arguments heard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further contends that there had been money transactions *inter se* the petitioner and the complainant on different dates but the same were not pertaining to the allegations levelled in the FIR but were friendly transactions that too of meagre amounts. He submits that the petitioner had never induced or cheated the complainant on the pretext of providing

**CRM-M-52859-2024****2**

any job to his wife nor has taken any amount from him on this score. A false case has been planted upon the petitioner and he is already in custody since 23.08.2024. He contends that after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented in the Court of learned Ilaqa Magistrate for trial and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time. Hence, prayed for grant of regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, by referring to the reply submitted by the State and on instructions from ASI Hari Om, Investigating Officer of the case present in Court, had admitted that the different amounts were transferred in the account of the petitioner on different dates and the same were not substantive. The filing of the challan in the learned trial Court and also the fact that the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents was admitted.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the allegations qua the petitioner levelled in the FIR have been that he had induced and defrauded the complainant by taking huge amount on the pretext of providing a job to the wife of complainant which he could not. The petitioner was arrested in this case on 23.08.2024 and after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented in the Court for trial. Admittedly, the investigating officer, present in Court, could not point out any substantive amount transferred in the account of petitioner by the complainant. The transactions have been of meagre amounts on different dates.



CRM-M-52859-2024

3

6. The conclusion of trial to ascertain criminal liability of the petitioner, if any, in the present case could only be ascertained after the conclusion of trial which will take sufficient long time. Admittedly, as per the reply submitted by the State, the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents. Therefore, no purpose will be served by detaining the petitioner in custody any more.

7. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

16.12.2024
kanika

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |