



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

CRM-M-11925-2025

Date of Decision:-25.08.2025

Sachin.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Pankaj Mehta, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Senior DAG Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this second petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.441 dated 30.09.2022 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 506, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Model Town Panipat.

2. The allegations against the Pooja (since granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 04.08.2025 in CRM-M-14777-2025), Dinesh (since granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 06.05.2025 in CRM-M-61154-2024), Neetu (since granted the concession of bail vide order dated 07.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-7456-2025) and Sachin (petitioner) is that they took Rs.64.5 lacs from the victim to provide him a government job.

3. The counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations against him are



baseless. There is a significant delay in the registration of the FIR. The dispute if any is of a civil nature. The version in the FIR and chargesheet is contradictory. As the petitioner is in custody since 14.05.2023, only 08 of the 31 Pws have been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded in near future. Therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail as the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and the co-accused have been granted bail.

4. The learned State counsel on the other hand contends that the allegations against the petitioner and his co-accused are grave. Therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of bail. He however concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 14.05.2023, that only 08 of the 31 Pws have been examined so far, that his co-accused have been granted the similar concession and that the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. This Court in the case *titled as Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab* bearing CRM-M-24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022 has held as under:-

“ Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts), in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”

7. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is stated to be in custody since 14.05.2023 and



only 08 of the 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Nothing significant has been pointed out by the State that the petitioner would abscond from the Trial, tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses if he is granted the concession of regular bail. Therefore, his further incarceration is not required.

8. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Sachin** son of Sh. Prem is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the cases mentioned in this order.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from the trial without sufficient cause.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

August 25, 2025
Vinay

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