



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

219

CRM-M-54915-2024

Date of decision: May 21st, 2025

Baljinder Singh @ Bijinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Maneesh Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.30 dated 09.02.2024 under Sections 420, 120-B of the IPC and Section 3(2) of The Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 registered at Police Station Panipat City.

2. Reply by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, HQ, Panipat, has been filed in Court, which is taken on record subject to just exceptions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and is in custody since 06.07.2024. It is contended that the allegations in the FIR (Annexure P1) revolve around the investment made by the complainant

in a company named Hindustan Energy Savers Private Limited, in which the petitioner had no role at the time of the alleged transactions.

4. It is submitted that the complainant has alleged having transferred a sum of ₹20,40,000/- to the account of the company, but the petitioner neither induced the complainant nor was associated with the company at the relevant time. Attention has also been drawn to the fact that while the complainant claimed to have attended a launch event of the company on 25.04.2023, no such event took place on that date. The actual launch was held on 26.04.2023, and it is a matter of record, the petitioner was not in any capacity associated with the company on either date.

5. It is further argued that the petitioner was a dealer (Area Channel Partner) of the Company and appointed as such only on 16.05.2023. It has also been asserted that the petitioner had immediately lodged a complaint with the Economic Offences Wing like the co-accused Ashu Jain. Learned counsel has also submitted that the complainant never met the petitioner nor was any money delivered to the petitioner, much less any inducement was made by the petitioner to the complainant to invest in the company.

6. It has been lastly urged that identically placed co-accused Ashu Jain and Madan Singh Rajpurohit have already been extended the concession of bail by this and hence the petitioner be also granted a similar concession more so when the trial would take considerable time to conclude coupled with the fact that further incarceration of the petitioner would, therefore, serve no useful purpose.

7. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has it been disputed

that charge sheet has already been filed before the learned trial Court. On further instructions, it has not been disputed that identically placed co-accused Ashu Jain and Madan Singh Rajpurohit have already been granted bail. However, it is contended that the petitioner, being a Area Channel Partner of the Company, cannot escape liability and that multiple investors have been defrauded of significant sums under the pretext of lucrative returns.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

9. The petitioner has been in custody since 06.07.2024. The investigation is complete and the charge sheet has been filed. The trial is yet to commence and is not likely to conclude in the near future. The role attributed to the petitioner appears to be substantially similar to that of co-accused Ashu Jain and Madan Singh Rajpurohit, who have already been extended the concession of bail. The presence of the petitioner at the time of the alleged inducement is also seriously disputed, and his appointment as Area Channel Partner postdates the relevant events.

10. In the totality of facts and circumstances, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. The learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any stringent conditions as it deems necessary to secure the presence of the petitioner during trial.

11. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

May 21st, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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