



CRM-M-21173-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-21173-2025

Reserved on: 4th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 12th August, 2025

Sanjeev Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. Sumanjit Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 553 dated 20.12.2023 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 20-B of IPC at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula.

2. As per the allegations, the petitioner, who was related to the complainant No.1-Prithvi Singh and was introduced by the latter to the complainants No. 2 to 6, had borrowed a sum of Rs. 26,00,000/- from the victims on the pretext of starting a business and by assuring them that he would refund this amount with good benefits. The said amount was given in the year 2019. In January, 2020, when the victims insisted the petitioner to return their money, he disclosed that he had suffered a loss in business. He, however, represented to the victims that instead of returning their money, he would secure jobs for their wards at PGIMER, Chandigarh. He handed over one appointment letter dated 18.03.2020, issued in the name of the son of



victim-Prithvi Singh, stating that he had been appointed as a Lower Division Clerk on regular basis in department of Gastroenterology, PGIMER, Chandigarh on a monthly salary of Rs. 30,000/-. He also assured the remaining victims that he would manage jobs for their children as well within a short span of time. However, subsequently, the victims came to know that the letter so issued was a forged and fabricated one and that they had been cheated. On their complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 30.09.2024. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject crime and also took the names of other accused persons involved with him. The co-accused Lovnish Dhalaria was arrested on 02.10.2024. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 30.09.2024. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. Trial would take considerable time to conclude. Co-accused Lovnish Dhalaria has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. His involvement in some other cases cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He is a habitual offender as he is involved in another case. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.



CRM-M-21173-2025

-3-

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and, in pursuance thereof, is alleged to have borrowed a sum of Rs. 26,00,000/- from the victims with a promise to return the same with handsome interest and is further alleged to have induced the victims to forgo the claim of that amount on the pretext of managing/securing jobs in PGIMER, Chandigarh in lieu thereof. He has been in custody since 30.09.2024. The trial has commenced but is likely to take time to conclude. The petitioner is stated to be involved in one more case of similar nature, however, he cannot be denied the benefit of bail merely due to that reason. The offence for which he has been booked is triable by Magistrate. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody. His presence can be secured even otherwise also. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the above discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

12th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned
s2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No
: Yes / No