



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

231

CRM-M-35259-2025

Date of decision: 11.07.2025

Vinod Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Ms. Sehej Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.123 dated 04.03.2018 under Sections 406, 420, 204, 506 read with Section 120-B of the IPC and Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in the Financial Establishment Act, 2013, registered at Police Station Sector 31, District Faridabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 31.01.2025. She submits that the petitioner was a Director in one of the 88 companies and had resigned in the year 2017; although the other co-accused, who too were 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



CRM-M-35259-2025

-2-

presented against the petitioner. It has further been brought to the notice of this Court that 19 out of the 21 prime accused which include all those who were specifically named and attributed a role in the crime in question and had also received various sums of money from the complainant/victims and had issued cheques which were subsequently dishonoured etc., had already been extended the concession of regular bail. Learned 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 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.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, on instructions, has not disputed that the entire case against the petitioner is based on documentary evidence; investigation against the petitioner is complete and challan stands presented. It has also not been disputed on instructions 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. However, it has been asserted by the learned State



CRM-M-35259-2025

counsel that the petitioner being the Director of SRS Limited, had also benefitted from the money which had been deposited by the complainant/victims in the account of the company till his resignation on 06.02.2017.

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

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 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. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court, therefore, deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner as there is no possibility of the trial concluding in the near future.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. 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.

7. 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.

11.07.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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