



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(225) CRM-M-12962-2025(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 21.04.2025

Parminder SinghPetitioner

VERSUS

State of HaryanaRespondent

(227) CRM-M-17844-2025(O&M)

Pinder SodhiPetitioner

VERSUS

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Gaurav Dutta, Advocate
with Mr. Vaibhav Bhargav, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-12962-2025.

Mr. Pawan Attri, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-17844-2025.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, I intend to dispose of abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.64 dated 07.03.2024, under Sections 384 and 120-B of IPC and later on added Section 420 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.
3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Amrik Singh. It was alleged that his daughter-in-law, namely, Suman had sold her ancestral land which was in her name and from that money she purchased another property in Pehowa. Out of the amount received



by selling the land, around Rs.59-60 lacs was left with her and the same was deposited in joint account of his daughter-in-law and son, namely, Sarvjit Singh in Punjab National Bank, Pehowa. On 17.06.2023, his son and daughter-in-law went to Ambala city to purchase some property and took Rs.10 lacs in cash with them. Then at around 11.30 am, four persons came to their house and told them that they were CBI officials having credible information that they have sold government land in Punjab and thereby, duped the government with lacs of rupees. The complainant, honestly believed them to be CBI officials and thus, they were threatened as they were posing themselves as CBI officials and under threat they took Rs.10 lacs which were kept in the bag of his son. Thereafter another Rs.10 lacs were withdrawn from the account of his son and daughter-in-law and by threatening, they further got RTGS done for Rs.21 lacs. It was thus, alleged that by posing as CBI officials, accused duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.52 lacs. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, on the disclosure statement of Pinder Sodhi (petitioner in CRM-M-17844-2025), name of co-accused-Parminder Singh, surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Whereas, on the disclosure of co-accused Paramjeet Singh, co-accused-Himmat Singh was arrayed as an accused. Accused Parminder Singh was arrested on 12.06.2024 and accused Pinder Sodhi was arrested on 20.04.2024. They approached the Court of Ld. Addl. Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, their applications were declined by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra vide orders dated 24.01.2025 and 18.03.2025 respectively. Aggrieved by the same, both the accused have approached this Court for grant of regular bail.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that the allegations are regarding siphoning of Rs.52 lacs from the complainant, however, the petitioners are neither named in the FIR, nor any transaction has been



made in their account. It is only on the disclosure statement of the co-accused, the petitioners have been arrayed as an accused in the present case and the disclosure statement in itself is not an admissible evidence. Counsel for the petitioners have submitted that the investigation is complete and after framing of charges, out of total eleven, five material witnesses already stands examined thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail. It is further submitted that out of seven accused, four are on bail and one is yet to be arrested and remaining two are present petitioners, who are before this Court. Learned counsel further prays for grant of bail to the petitioners on the basis of parity with the co-accused Paramjit Singh and Himmat Singh, who have already been extended benefit of regular bail by this Court vide common order dated 04.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-42397-2024 and CRM-M-55-978-2024.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. Reply, by way of an affidavit of Mr. Om Parkash, HPS, DSP, City Thanesar, Kurukshetra, on behalf of respondent, filed by learned State counsel in Court today is taken on record. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have been examined. He, submits that the petitioner-Parminder Singh has four more criminal cases against him and so far as petitioner -Pinder Sodhi is concerned, his disclosure statement Annexures R-2 and R-3 have been produced on record alongwith Recovery Memo Ex.R.4. He has not disputed the fact that co-accused Paramjit Singh and Himmat Singh have already been allowed bail by this Court vide order dated 04.03.2025.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it transpires that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have already been examined. As submitted by learned State counsel out of total seven accused, four are on bail and one is yet to be arrested. It is also an admitted fact that out of total seven accused, four have already been released on bail and one accused is yet to be arrested.



7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail.

Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

21.04.2025
mamta

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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