

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

209

2025:PHHC:170551



**CRM-M-42043-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.12.2025.**

NITIN KUMAR**...Petitioner(s)****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****...Respondent(s)****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Robin K. Hooda, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.537 dated 26.11.2019, under Section(s) 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 201 and 419 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sector 5, District Panchkula.

2 The FIR in the case in hand has been registered on the basis of a complaint dated 01.07.2019 by Shri Parminder Singh, Colonel (Retd.) son of Major General Bachittar Singh (Retd.), resident of House No.1096, Sector-2, Panchkula. The complainant stated that the father of the complainant Major General Bachittar Singh (Retd.) is a senior citizen who retired from Indian Army after dedicating 38 years of his life to the country. Said Major General

Bachittar Singh (Retd.) was allured fraudulently to buy insurance policies of 'Aegon Religare' in the year, 2010. In the year, 2014, the father of the complainant received a telephonic call via landline and mobile and the caller told him that an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- was lying pending in his Aegon Religare account and enquired as to why the father of the complainant had not claimed the said amount. The complainant stated that the caller made him deposit more money in different accounts on one pretext or the other. Thereafter, the father of the complainant fell into the trap of the accused persons and deposited various amounts through cheques, NEFTS and RTGS into various accounts. In this manner, the father of the complainant deposited the total amount of Rs.83.16 lakh with the persons namely Ajay Sharma, Jagmohan Tiwari, Avinash Pathak, Ashish Gupta, Surya Narayan, Nirmal Sharma and other accused persons unknown to them, against whom the complainant sought strict legal action.

3 Custody certificate placed on record.

4 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that initially the FIR was registered in the year 2019 and during investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 09.07.2024 i.e. after a gap of nearly 06 years. The allegation against the petitioner was that he opened one bank account on 19.01.2016 on the basis of identities wherein certain amounts were deposited by father of the complainant. Similar accounts were also opened in Union Bank of India wherein an amount of Rs.1,50,000/- was got deposited. He contends that the documents were alleged to have been forged by co-accused Arman @ Salman on his laptop. The said co-accused has already been granted the concession of pre-arrest bail by the Court. He

contends that as per the allegations of the prosecution, the petitioner was to get 3% commission from the money deposited in the said account, however, no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner. He further submits that notwithstanding the petitioner having undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year and 04 months and the trial being a Magistrate trial, only two witnesses out of 25 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far.

5 State counsel does not dispute the facts noticed above.

6 Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner which is more than 01 year and 04 months and noticing the stage of the trial where only 02 witnesses out of 25 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined, I find that the conclusion of trial will take long time. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7 It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

December 08, 2025.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No