



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-45497-2025
Date of decision: 26.08.2025

SIDHARTH SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Amit Kumar Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No. 252 dated 09.07.2016, under Sections 420, 406, 506 and 34 IPC registered at Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution, the FIR has been registered on the complaint of one Ishwar Singh against the accused persons other than the petitioner on the ground that the accused allured the complainant to make an investment in one Poonam Multispecialty Hospital that was to be opened and that in the event of any such investment, a very good return to an extent of double the amount invested shall be earned. On such an allurements, the complainant parted away with a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs. Counsel contends that



the petitioner is not the person who either made any assurance or to whose account any amount was transferred. The money in question has been statedly paid to the Managing Director of Poonam Multispecialty Hospital, who is reported to have died. He contends that the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused only on the ground that some amount was received in the account of his father and that a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs was given by his father to him to start his business. It is contended that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him and that the petitioner cannot be held liable for the acts of his father. He not being complicit of the offence or being a conspirator in commission of the said offence, should not be kept behind bars. It is further submitted that investigation in the matter is already complete and a final report stands filed. The petitioner is already in judicial custody and no investigation is pending against him.

3. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the said factual aspects.
4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.
5. Taking into consideration the circumstances noticed above, the age of the petitioner, the absence of recovery, the absence of any allurement or assurance on the part of the petitioner to the complainant as also the petitioner being in judicial custody and no recovery having been effected from him, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.



CRM-M-45497-2025

-3-

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular 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.

AUGUST 26, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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