



CRM-M-15168 of 2025 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

CRM-M-15168 of 2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 3rd May, 2025

Bhagwan Singh Gill @ Bhagwnat Gill

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Dr. Rishi Pal Singh, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. AG Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Bhagwan Singh Gill @ Bhagwnat Gill	254	03.06.2024	406, 420, 120-B IPC and 3 of Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013	Ramnagar Karnal	Karnal

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been involved in the present case falsely, though there is no direct involvement in the alleged crime. Till date, no substantive evidence has been collected to highlight/to show that petitioner is direct beneficiary in any crime though investigation is over. After completion of investigation,



challan and final report has already been submitted, however, charges are yet to be framed. At best, petitioner or the society can be alleged to have duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.25 lakh whereas, during investigation nothing material has been recovered from him. Learned counsel contends that charges are yet to be framed and there is a list of total 56 prosecution witnesses and in the process of exhausting the list of prosecution witnesses, considerable time of several years would be consumed by the prosecution, therefore, personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period. Further submits that once final report is submitted, custodial interrogation would not be required anymore and rather offences are triable by the Magisterial court.

3. On the other hand, while opposing the contention for bail, learned Addl. AG submits that during the course of investigation, an amount of Rs.1,01,88,775/- was found to be withdrawn from his account and apart this an amount of Rs.4,69,500/- was still there in the account. Thus, submits that involvement of the petitioner is very much proved because direct evidence is there on record. Learned State counsel informs that the petitioner is involved in two other criminal cases, which are also of similar nature.

4. I have considered the submissions and examined the petition along with status report which has been filed by the State today before the Court.

5. The Court is of view that after completion of investigation and submissions of challan in the present case, which is triable by learned Magistrarte, further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose to the prosecution. Since, there is list of 56 prosecution witnesses undoubtedly in exhausting the list of witnesses considerable time is likely



to be consumed. The case of the prosecution would much depend upon the documentary evidence, which is either there with the prosecution agency or already appended along with the final report submitted under Section 193 BNSS (173 Cr.P.C.). Process of recording of statements of witnesses is yet to start. Therefore, taking note of all the aforementioned aspect, petition is allowed, and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. In view of above, the interim bail application is also disposed of without passing any separate order.
7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.
9. Petition stands disposed of.

3rd May, 2025

reema

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No