



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

225

CRM-M-59240-2023

Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Saiyyad Ali Mohmad Shah

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present : Mr. Raj Kumar Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

Mr. Neeru Bansal, Advocate, for the complainant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.619 dated 04.09.2019, under Sections 120B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Gharaunda District Karnal.
2. The allegations against the petitioner are that petitioner along with his co-accused took huge money from 400 different persons with an assurance to provide them job in Indian Army at various positions on the civil side but subsequently the accused persons failed to fulfill their promise and also refused to return the money.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations are grave, however, status of trial is that out of 65 witnesses, 40 have been examined so far. The present petitioner has undergone more than 3 years of sentence and is facing Magisterial trial wherein if awarded, the sentence could not be more than 7 years in the given circumstances. However, he has already undergone more than 3 years of sentence. Learned counsel further submits that in view of the above and the fact that the trial is likely to take some time



for its conclusion, continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate dated 03.07.2025, the petitioner is in custody for 03 years 05 months and 17 days.

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

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the undergone period; trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and as such, 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 a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is hereby 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.

8. 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.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

07.07.2025
anil

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