

2025:PHHC:015047



215/2.

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

**CRM-M-36119-2024**

Date of decision: 30.01.2025

Rajesh Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate and  
Ms. Supriya Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

-----

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail, filed under Section 483 read with Section 528 of B.N.S.S., 2023, in case FIR No.393, dated 08.07.2023, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 506 of IPC (Sections 201, 465, 467, 468, 471 of IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala, wherein he has been made an accused for allegedly inducing the complainant to invest an amount of Rs.2,47,00,000/- in an immigration business based in Dubai, along with other co-accused. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the present case arises from a strained personal relationship between the petitioner and the complainant, which has now been given a criminal complexion.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 14.03.2024 in a magisterial trial. The investigation in the matter has been concluded, and the challan has already been presented before the trial Court on 31.01.2024. Furthermore, charges have been framed on 21.03.2024. It has been further argued that the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future, as none of the 63 prosecution witnesses cited in the challan have been examined to-date. Furthermore, it has been asserted that the case primarily hinges on documentary evidence, and there is no further recovery to be made from the petitioner.

It has also been urged by the learned counsel that one of the co-accused, Rahul Kapoor, who is allegedly the prime conspirator and had played an active role in the commission of the offence, has already been granted bail by this Court. It is, therefore, prayed that since the petitioner is similarly situated, he may also be admitted to bail as there can be no risk of the petitioner tampering with evidence which, as already submitted, is part of the challan now.

*Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite. It has been argued that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and has actively participated in the commission of the offence. However, the learned State counsel, on instruction, has not been able to dispute the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 14.03.2024, that the investigation is complete, and that charges have already been framed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

The petitioner has been in custody in a case primarily based on documentary evidence since 14.03.2024. There is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future as none of the 63 prosecution witnesses have yet been examined. In the circumstances, more so when it is a magisterial trial, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner

Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**January 30, 2025**  
sanjeev

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:        | Yes/No |