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

290

CRM-M-18353-2025
Date of Decision: 13.05.2025

Manbir Singh @ Manvir Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana …Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. K.S. Virk, Advocate and
Ms. Payal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

****

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
514	22.08.2024	City Hansi, District Hisar	406 and 420 IPC (Section 120-B IPC added later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. In paragraph 11 of the bail petition and as per paragraph 13 (H) of the status report, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
1.	320	01.11.2022	Ding, District Sirsa	174-A IPC
2.	346	03.11.2022	Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa	174-A IPC
3.	548	20.11.2022	Sadar Sirsa, District Sirsa	174-A IPC
4.	550	21.10.2022	Sadar Sirsa, District Sirsa	174-A IPC

3. Status report dated 05.05.2025 and custody certificate dated 12.05.2025 filed by State counsel today in the Court are taken on record. Copies thereof have been supplied to counsel for the petitioner.

4. The facts and allegations are being taken from the status report filed by the State, which reads as follows:

JYOTI
2025.05.15 09:48
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.

2. "That the brief facts of the case are that a complaint was received in the office of Superintendent of Police, Hansi for initiating action against Manbir Singh, Dalbir Singh, Venkata Ramana Murti and Kamaludin Khan with the allegations of committing fraud with the father of the complainant. As per the allegations against the accused they duped the father of the complainant with an assurance that they would get him appointed as Governor of Andaman Nicobar Island. Under the garb of this assurance, they took Rs.10,45,00,000/- (Ten Crore Forty five Lacs) including Rs.8,45,00,000/- (Eight Crore Forty five Lacs) by bank transactions and Rs.2,00,00,000/- (Two Crore) in cash. After the fraud was detected, co-accused Manbir Singh returned Rs.10,00,000/- (Ten Lacs) to his father. In pursuance of the investigation of the case bank statements of concerned banks were collected by the investigating officer and found the allegations to be true. It is further submitted that the allegations against the co-accused Kamaludin are that in the month of February, 2021; complainant and his father were present in the house No. 830, Sector 17-A, Gurugram of their relative. Co-accused Kamaluddin came and told them that he had a word with co-accused Manbir Singh (present petitioner) and another accused namely Venkata Ramana Murti and they would soon get him appointed as Deputy Governor of Andaman and Nicobar. He asked his father to give him Rs.20,00,000/- (Twenty Lacs) as a donation of his NGO. According to his request, his father Late Surender Malik transferred Rs.20,00,000/- (Twenty Lacs) in the Bank account of NGO, Umed Health Care Society. After few days, his father alongwith his cousin Mandeep went to the office of Kamaluddin and paid Rs.20,00,000/-(Twenty Lacs) in cash. During the course of the investigation of the case Rs.20,00,000/- (Twenty lacs) were found to be transferred from account No.2011211xxxxx of AU Small finance Bank to co-accused Kamaluddin's NGO's Umed Health Care Society. It is further submitted that during the investigation of the case it has been found that the allegations against the co-accused Dalbir Singh are that he alongwith present petitioner namely Manvir Singh grabbed Rs.1,00,00,000/- (One Crore) and alleged amount was credited in the account No.236810xxxxx Canara Bank of co-accused Dalbir Singh from the account No.534901xxxxx Bank of Baroda namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 14.09.2020. Copy of transaction details is annexed herewith as Annexure R-1. It is pertinent to mention here that when complainant's father Surender Malik detected the fraud, co-accused namely Dalbir Singh returned Rs.10,00,000/- (Ten Lacs) to account No.5349010xxxxx Bank of Baroda namely Surender Malik by co-accused

JYOTI
2025.05.15 09:48
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this order/judgment.

Dalbir Singh from his account No.236810xxxxxx Canara Bank on dated 02.12.2022. An amount Rs.50,00,000/- (Fifty Lacs) was credited in the account No.113305xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Sunny Sales Corporation from the account No.5349010xxxxxx Bank of Baroda namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 11.09.2020. An amount Rs.1,50,00,000/- (One Crore Fifty Lacs) was credited in the account No.003105xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Rolex Trading Corporation from the account No.17311000xxxxx HDFC Bank namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 11.09.2020. An amount of Rs.2,00,00,000/- (Two Crore) was credited in the account No.003105xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Rolex Trading Corporation from the account No. 5349010xxxxx Bank of Baroda namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 18.12.2020 and 19.12.2020. An amount of Rs.1,00,00,000/- (One Crore) was credited in the account No.695605xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Mahadev Traders from the account No.534901xxxxx Bank of Baroda namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 18.12.2020. An amount of Rs.95,00,000/- (Ninty Five Lacs) was credited in the account No.003105xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Rolex Trading Corporation from the account No.5349010xxxxxx Bank of Baroda namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 13.01.2021. An amount of Rs.2,50,00,000/- (Two Crore Fifty Lacs) was credited in the account No.69560xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Mahadev Traders from the account No.201121xxxxx AU Small Finance namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 13.01.2021, 28.01.2021, 03.02.2021 and 04.02.2021. An amount of Rs.20,00,000/- (Twenty Lacs) was credited in the account No.031101xxxxx ICICI Bank in the name of Umed Health Care Society from the account No.201121xxxxx AU Small Finance namely Surender Malik i.e. father of the complainant on dated 06.02.2021. It is specifically submitted that Rs.1,00,00,000/- (One crore) cash was given to present petitioner accused Manbir and Rs.1,00,00,000/- (One crore) cash was given to co-accused Shri Mallah Venkata Ramana Murti and Rs.20,00,000/- cash was given to co-accused Kamalludin Khan."

5. In compliance of order dated 06.05.2025 passed by this Court, counsel for the petitioner has handed over original affidavit to State counsel and photocopy of the same to counsel for the complainant today in the Court.

6. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.

JYOTI
2025.05.15 09:48
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this order/judgment.

7. The State as well as counsel for the complainant opposes bail and refers to the status report.

8. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

> *"10. That present petitioner-accused Manbir Singh got transferred an amount of Rs. 1 crore from the complainant's father in his father-in-law account and from the same he had been transferred Rs. 83,00,000/- to his known person's account. During his interrogation it has been found that he had taken Rs. 1 crore cash from the complainant's father and Rs. 50 lacs from co-accused Venkata Ramana Murti. It is pertinent to mention here that thus he got Rs. 2.33 crore and after that he had been returned Rs. 25 lacs to deceased Surender Malik i.e. complainant's father as cash. Thus, present petitioner grabbed the money Rs. 2.08 crore from the complainant's father on the pretext to appointed him as Lieutenant Governor."*

REASONING:

9. Allegations against the petitioner are that he in connivance with other co-accused cheated the father of the complainant for a massive amount with a lure to get him appointed as governor of Andaman and Nicobar. Petitioner introduced the other accused to the father of the complainant. Amount of Rs. 25 lacs have already been recovered out of Rs. 2.33 crores from the petitioner. To prove his bonafide, the petitioner has declared all his assets, which is a factor to consider case of petitioner for bail**.**

10. There is sufficient primafacie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. As per paragraph 06 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 25.08.2024. As per the custody certificate dated 12.05.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 08 months and 08 days. Given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the primafacie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

11. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

12. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest

JYOTI
2025.05.15 09:48
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this order/judgment.

Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

13. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

14. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

15. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

16. ***This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.***

17. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

18. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

19. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

13.05.2025
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.

JYOTI
2025.05.15 09:48
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this order/judgment.