



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

235

CRM-M-38738-2025
Date of decision: 25.07.2025

HARCHARAN SINGH @ SONU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. Krishan Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.57 dated 19.03.2025, under Sections 61, 340, 338, 336(3), 318(4) and 316(2) of IPC registered at Police Station Sector-14, District Panchkula.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that complainant had advanced a loan of Rs.90 Lakhs to the petitioner for the purchase of machinery. He further submits that M/s J. K. Machine Tools did not deliver the machine. Moreover, it is alleged by the bank officials that the lease was not executed where the factory was to be set up. However, it is alleged that during investigation, the petitioner-Harcharan Singh was arrested on 03.04.2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the main accused in the present FIR is Amit Kumar who approached the Bank for sanctioning the loan through agent and they in connivance with each other got sanctioned the loan and some of the amount was transferred in the account of the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months, and no further recovery has to be got effected from him and the



trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, the petitioner be released on regular bail.

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner by way of filing of custody certificate dated 24.07.2025 as per which the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 19 days. He further submits that petitioner has caused huge loss to the public money to the tune of Rs.90 Lakhs to the public sector bank by playing fraud and cheating by furnishing forged and fabricated documents.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel, and the fact that petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 19 days; the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

25th July, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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