



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

CRM-M-26846-2025

Date of decision :30.07.2025

Vinod Kumar

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Sehaj Sandhawalia, Advocate and
Mr. Himanshu Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.122 dated 04.03.2018, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B, 204 of IPC and Section 3 of Haryana Protection of Interest of depositors in the Financial Establishment Act, 2013, registered at Police Station Sector-31, District Faridabad. Further prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner under Section 480(6) of BNSS in the abovementioned FIR.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the present case has been registered on the complaint submitted by Ramesh Garg against Anil Jindal, Chairman SRS Group, Prateek Jindal, Vinod Garg @ Mama, Bishan Bansal, Nanak Tayal, P.K. Kapoor, J.K. Garg and other Directors and employees of SRS Group. It was alleged that he knows accused Vinod Garg, who is known as Mama, who induced him to make investment in the SRS Group, who is constructing plots and flats by stating that the Director of SRS company is his nephew (Bhanja) and in case, the

complainant made investment in the said project, then he would get land on cheap rates and till the plot/flat is constructed, he would get interest @1.5% per month on the said amount. The complainant, under influence, also invested in the said project and lateron he came to know that the aforesaid officials had cheated several other innocent persons also. On protest, these accused promised the complainant and other persons to return the money. Thereafter, the complainant got a cheque to the tune of Rs.9,50,000/-, however, the same got dishonoured and in this manner they cheated the complainant and other persons. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad vide order dated 28.12.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the FIR has been registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B, 204 of IPC and Section 3 of Haryana Protection of Interest of depositors in the Financial Establishment Act, 2013, however, at the time of filing of challan, offences under Sections 467, 468, 471 of the IPC were added. Thus, he prays that the FIR be read along with these Sections.

4. On oral request of learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Sections 467, 468, 471 of the IPC are ordered to be incorporate in the head note and prayer clause of the petition. The Registry is directed to do the needful in the paperbook wherever required.

5. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 31.01.2025. He submits that the petitioner was the Director in one of the 88 companies of SRS group and had resigned in the year 2017 as asked him so; although the other co-accused, who were also Directors of the company, have been specifically named and attributed roles in the FIR in question, no such specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. It has also been submitted by the learned senior counsel that the entire case of the prosecution against the petitioner is based on documentary evidence which is now part of the challan, which stands presented against the petitioner. He further submits that the main accused in the FIR, had already been extended the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 27.05.2020 passed in CRM-M-23391-2019. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that although the petitioner is booked in several other criminal cases wherein identical allegations such as the one in the present case have been levelled, however, it is a matter of record that he has since been extended the concession of anticipatory bail in all those cases by the Coordinate Benches of this Court, which are annexed along with the petition, and he has not misused the said concession. Learned senior counsel has, therefore, submitted that in the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, in case the petitioner is enlarged on bail there can be no apprehension of the petitioner misusing the said concession by tampering with evidence, as it is already part of the challan.

6. Status report dated 18.07.2025 by way of affidavit of Rajesh Kumar Lohan, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sarai, Faridabad on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by the learned State

counsel and the same is taken on record.

7. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner, however, has not disputed that the entire case against the petitioner is based on documentary evidence. She submits that out of total 59 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far. She submits that investigation is complete and challan stands presented. She endorsed the fact that all the prime accused who were named in the FIR and had been attributed specific roles therein, have already been enlarged on regular bail. She has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.

8. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 31.01.2025. All the prime accused who were named in the FIR and had been attributed specific roles, have already been enlarged on regular bail. The entire case of the prosecution is based on documentary evidence which is part of the challan, which already stands presented against the petitioner. As submitted before this Court, out of total 59 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far.

9. 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 petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the



satisfaction of the concerned Court/Duty Magistrate.

10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

30.07.2025
ps-I

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE