



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

296

CRM-M No.54705 of 2024
Date of Decision: 17.12.2024

Parveen Kumar @ Parveen Yadav
@ Praveen Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
25	18.01.2022	Manesar, District Gurugram	120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered against the present petitioner and the co-accused on the basis of written complaint lodged by the complainant Santlal, proprietor of SBN Corporation on the allegations that he was introduced with the petitioner by one Kiran Pal Yadav who was acquainted with him in May 2021. The petitioner while

2024:PHHC:169412



representing him as an IPS Officer posted as Group Commandant in National Security Guard (For short “NSG”) Manesar had represented to him that he could secure contracts for work order in the campus of NSG Manesar and had induced him to initially issue a cheque for a sum of Rs.1,35,22,500/- and then a cheque for a sum of Rs.1,66,32,000/- on the pretext that the said amount was to be given as security for the purpose of securing the contract work. He was made to submit quotation letter and GST certificates and it was represented to him that the work of construction of a 11 KM long boundary wall of the premises of NSG Manesar was allotted to him. Subsequently, the complainant came to know that the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused Mamta Yadav who is his wife working as Manager in Axis Bank and other co-accused, who are his family members had opened bank account in Axis Bank on the basis of false and fabricated documents and misappropriated the amount of the cheque given by the complainant and converted the same to his own use. The petitioner failed to return the amount of cheque. No work order was infact issued by NSG in favour of the complainant and in this manner, the complainant was duped of huge amount of money. He came to know that the petitioner had cheated several other persons in the similar manner. As such, he prayed for taking action. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 09.02.2022. The co-accused were also arrested. Investigation has since been completed.

2024:PHHC:169412



been falsely implicated in this case. Investigation has completed. Challan has been presented against him. The trial is likely to take time. He has small children and one of his son is suffering from low immunity. The co-accused have already been extended benefit of bail. He is on bail in other cases registered against him. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. His further detention would not serve any useful purpose. As such, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He is a habitual offender since five more cases of similar nature have been registered against him. He has duped several other persons of huge amounts of money which is approximately 100 crores. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences and even intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record.

6. The petitioner in conspiracy with the co-accused is alleged to have duped the complainant by impersonating himself as an IPS Officer and by inducing him that he will procure work order for the complainant for construction work in NSG, Manesar. He is further alleged to have caused wrongful loss to the tune of Rs.1,66,32,000/- to the complainant and is further alleged to have misappropriated the abovementioned amount. There

2024:PHHC:169412



are as many as 106 prosecution witnesses and as per the status report, none has been examined so far despite the fact that charges in this case have been framed on 20.03.2023. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. Ofcourse, the trial is likely to take long time. No doubt, the petitioner is having criminal antecedents. However, he has been extended benefit of bail in most of the cases as pending against him. It cannot be ignored that appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to evidence in a particular case only. The involvement of the petitioner in other cases cannot be considered to be a sole ground for denying concession of bail to the petitioner. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, subject to the condition that he will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court and shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer and further subject to the condition that till the conclusion of the trial, he shall appear before the concerned Police Station once in the first Monday of every month. He shall disclose his present as well as permanent address before the learned trial Court at the time of furnishing of bonds and shall also give copy of his Aadhar Card, PAN Card if any and details of his



mobile phone number to the learned trial Court and in case, any change in his address or mobile phone number takes place, then he shall inform about the same to the learned trial Court in advance.

7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

17.12.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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