



CRM-M-4745-2025

-1-

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

232

CRM-M-4745-2025

Date of Decision: 20.05.2025

ROHIT KUMAR

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Davneet Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case FIR No. 619 dated 15.11.2024 under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 351(2) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 10/24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been alleged that the petitioner has embezzled an amount of Rs. 24 lakhs on the pretext of sending the nephew of the complainant abroad. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 15.11.2024.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has filed the custody

**CRM-M-4745-2025****-2-**

certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and 29 days. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that petitioner is involved in two other cases. The challan has already been presented. On asking, he submits that there is only disclosure statement of the co-accused against the petitioner and no other evidence has come on record.

5. Mr. S.N.Pillania, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant and opposes the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has played active role in the offence.

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

7. In view of the above submission of learned counsels, since the trial is yet to commence and the same is likely to take time and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and 29 days and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



CRM-M-4745-2025

-3-

9. It is clarified that if on bail, so granted through the instant order, the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

20.05.2025

renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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