

CRM-M-42397-2024
CRM-M-55978-2024
220+222

1

2025.PHHC.030483



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

1. CRM-M-42397-2024

Paramjeet SinghPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

2. CRM-M-55978-2024

Himmat SinghPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

Date of decision : 04.03.2025

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Monika Khatri, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-42397-2024.

Mr. Harpreet Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Lovepreet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-55978-2024.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Kushagra Beniwal, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, I intend to dispose of abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.64 dated 07.03.2024, under Sections 384 and 120-B of IPC and later on added Section 420 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Amrik Singh. It was alleged that his



daughter-in-law, namely, Suman had sold her ancestral land which was in her name and from that money she purchased another property in Pehowa. Out of the amount received by selling the land around Rs.59-60 lacs was left with her. Same was deposited in joint account of his daughter-in-law and son, namely, Sarvjit Singh in Punjab National Bank, Pehowa. On 17.06.2023, his son and daughter-in-law went to Ambala city to purchase some property and took Rs.10 lacs in cash with them. Then at around 11.30 am, four persons came to their house and told them that they were CBI officials and also said that they had credible information that they have sold government land in Punjab and therefore, duped the government with lakhs of rupees. The complainant, honestly believed them that they were CBI officials and thus, they were threatened and under the threat they were posing themselves as CBI officials, they took Rs.10 lacs which were kept in the bag of his son. Thereafter another Rs.10 lacs were withdrawn from the account of his son and daughter-in-law and by threatening, they got RTGS done for Rs.21 lacs. It was thus, alleged that by posing as CBI officials, accused duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.52 lacs. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, on the disclosure statement of Pinder Sodhi, name of petitioner-Paramjeet Singh, was surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Whereas, on the disclosure of Paramjeet Singh, petitioner-Himmat Singh was arrayed as an accused. Petitioner-Paramjeet Singh was arrested on 12.06.2024, whereas petitioner-Himmat Singh was arrested on 22.08.2024. They approached the Court of Id. Special Judge, Ludhiana and Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra



for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, their applications were declined by the trial Courts vide orders dated 17.08.2024 and 19.10.2024, respectively. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that the allegations are regarding siphoning of Rs.52 lacs from the complainant, however, the petitioners are neither named in the FIR, nor any transaction have been made in their account. It is only on the disclosure statement of the co-accused, the petitioners have been arrayed as an accused in the present case and the disclosure statement in itself is not an admissible evidence. Counsel for the petitioner-Himmat Singh, has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. However, counsel for petitioner-Paramjeet Singh, has submitted that the petitioner was involved in one more case, however, he has been acquitted in the same. It is also submitted that the investigation is complete and on framing of charges, the material witnesses already stands examined thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has stated that the petitioners were part of the conspiracy with the co-accused and by posing as CBI officials, all the accused have duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.52 lacs. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have been examined. He, submits that the petitioner-Himmat Singh has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any case and so far as petitioner -Paramjeet Singh



is concerned, he was involved in one more case, however, he stands acquitted in the same.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that both the petitioners before this Court were arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. The petitioners are behind bars since 12.06.2024 and 22.08.2024, respectively. Out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have already been examined. As submitted by learned State counsel petitioner-Himmat Singh has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any case and petitioner-Paramjeet Singh was involved in one more case, however, he stands acquitted in the same.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

04.03.2025
ps-I

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