



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-36382-2025 (O&M)  
Decided on : 17.07.2025

Somdutt Verma . . . Petitioner(s)  
Versus  
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Sakshi Khera, Advocate (through V.C.)  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ashok K. Chaudhary, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

| Name of Petitioner(s) | FIR No. | Date       | Section(s)                                                      | Police Station | District  |
|-----------------------|---------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Somdutt Verma         | 11      | 11.01.2025 | 316(2), 318(4), 319(2), 61(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) of BNS, 2023 | Sector 17      | Faridabad |

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that

(I) All the offences alleged are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate.

(ii) It is not even the case of the prosecution that any amount has been credited in the bank account of the petitioner, nor is there any allegation that the petitioner either appended his signatures or had identified his paternal aunt ('Bua'), who allegedly



impersonated one 'Hardei Devi' as the rightful owner of the property in question.

- (iii) The prosecution primarily relies on CCTV footage to allege that the petitioner was seen in the company of co-accused persons, who also allegedly accompanying Shakuntala to the location where the deal was finalized.
- (iv) The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 03.02.2025, and as far as he is concerned, investigation is stated to be complete and the challan has already been presented before the competent Court.
- (v) Since the trial is not expected to conclude in the near future, continued incarceration of the petitioner would amount, depriving of his personal liberty for an indefinite period.

Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner by submitting that he is one of the main accused in the case, who allegedly accompanied said 'Shakuntala' and actively participated by impersonating actual 'Hardei Devi' for the purposes of executing the impugned transaction. Further, submits that said fact finds corroboration through the CCTV footage relied upon by the prosecution. However, both the learned counsels fairly concede that the said CCTV footage, like other prosecution evidence, is yet to be subjected to judicial scrutiny and proof during the course of trial.

4. Further, it is contended that during the course of investigation, a



recovery of ₹5.00 lakhs was effected from the possession of the petitioner, and that such recovery, though partial, *prima facie* indicates that he had received a significant amount pursuant to the transaction in question. It is also submitted that the petitioner did not cooperate during investigation with respect to facilitate the recovery of complete amount involved, which had been received.

Nevertheless, there is any denial of the fact that all the offences alleged against the petitioner are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, and the investigation, insofar as the petitioner is concerned, stands concluded.

5. Having considered the rival submissions and taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and investigation *qua* the petitioner is already complete, coupled with the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.02.2025, this Court is of the view that the continued incarceration of the petitioner is not warranted at this stage. Notably, the prosecution has neither recovered any document bearing the handwriting or signature of the petitioner, nor has any evidence surfaced to suggest that any amount was credited into his bank account. Accordingly, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat



and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

July 17, 2025  
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
Whether Reportable: Yes/No