



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**  
**(225-B) CRM-M-46374-2025 (O & M)**  
**Date of decision: 03.11.2025**

Ranadeep Ghoshal

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Shailender Kashyap, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)**

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.63 dated 07.02.2021 under Sections 420 IPC (Sections 406, 506 and 120-B IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Sector 29, DLF, District Gurugram, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner and his co-accused received a total sum of Rs.14,86,200/- (approximately) to send the complainant-Vivek Sharma to Germany. However, the complainant-victim was not sent and the entire money was defalcated.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Kaushik Bose has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 18.05.2022 passed in CRM-M-46058-2021 (Annexure P-2). Two co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Prateek Nepalia



and Ashima Malhotra have been granted the concession of regular bail by the Trial Court vide orders dated 31.03.2022 and 15.09.2022 (Annexures P-3 and P-4 respectively). As the petitioner is in custody since 25.02.2025 but none of the 21 witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner is an accused in 13 other cases of a similar nature. He was also absconding at one stage. Three co-accused, namely, Sandeepan Kavirajan, Subroto Sen, Shailaj Srivastava are still absconding. The nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and his criminal antecedent do not entitle him to the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that three co-accused/Kaushik Bose, Prateek Nepalia and Ashima Malhotra have been granted the concession of either anticipatory bail or regular bail, that the petitioner is in custody since 25.02.2025 and that none of the 21 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. This Court in the case titled as ***Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab bearing CRM-M24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022*** has held as under:-

*“Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts) , in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this*



*would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”*

7. In the instant case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody since 25.02.2025 but none of the 21 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. Three co-accused of the petitioner have been granted the concession of either anticipatory bail or regular bail. The present case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and no serious apprehension has been expressed by the State that the petitioner would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses if granted the concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Ranadeep Ghoshal is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other case/crime other than the case(s) referred to in the present petition.

10. If any attempt whatsoever is made by the petitioner and/or his family members/friends to contact/threaten/intimidate any of the witnesses of the present occurrence, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.



11. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.
12. The petition stands disposed of.
13. The pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of accordingly.

( JASJIT SINGH BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 03, 2025  
sukhpreet

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