

2025:PHHC:087030



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

219

**CRM-M-31343-2025
Decided on:04.07.2025**

Harpreet Singh Maan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj

Present: Mr. G.S. Salana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present second petition, filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner during pendency of the trial in case FIR No.199 dated 01.06.2024, registered under Sections 406, 420, 506 of IPC, 1860, at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Harguneet Singh, who has alleged that he had transferred Rs.5 lacs through bank account of his mother in the bank account of the petitioner for the purchase of a plot. However, the petitioner, alongwith co-accused Trilochan Singh Mann got registered a plot of land measuring 290 square yards for Rs.5 lacs. However, neither possession of the plot was handed over to the complainant nor his money was returned and, thus, the FIR got registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and during investigation, the investigating agencies collected various evidences against the petitioner and on completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The learned trial Court, on

2025:PHHC:087030



framing the charges, commenced with the trial. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala praying for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned trial Court declined the same vide order dated 14.05.2025. Hence, aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner is before this Court by of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that there is an unexplained delay of 22 years in lodging the FIR as the talks regarding purchase of the plot had taken place in the year 2002. It is submitted that the dispute is purely of civil nature and the charges were framed in the present case on 07.11.2024 but, thereafter the supplementary challan against Tarlocahn Singh was filed. The charges against co-accused Tarlochan Singh were framed on 16.01.2025. He further submitted that from the facts and circumstances of the case, it is apparent that the prosecution has failed to conclude the trial within 60 days from the date of taking evidence and, thus, the petitioner is entitled for grant of bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioner who has duped the complainant after taking money in the name of plot. Neither the money was returned nor possession of the plot was handed over to him. It is submitted that the learned trial Court had duly appreciated the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and in view of the reasoning given, there is no intentional delay on the part of the prosecution and hence, the petition filed by the petitioner praying for grant of bail read with the provisions of 437(6) Cr.P.C. has rightly been dismissed. He further submitted that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-61606 of 2024, which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.02.2025. He has also produced custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. While referring

2025:PHHC:087030



to the custody certificate, he has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the available record, it is deciphered that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-61606 of 2024, which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.02.2025. There are no substantive changes in the circumstances thereafter. Even otherwise, perusal of the custody certificate would show that the petitioner is a habitual offender being involved in 17 criminal cases of similar nature and in one of the cases; he has been convicted as well. Since the trial is at the initial stage, therefore, grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage would prejudice the trial.

6. Keeping in view overall attending circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for the grant of bail at this stage and hence, the present petition, being denuded of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

7. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

July 04, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: NO/YES
Whether Reportable: NO/YES