



CRM-M-53584-2025

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

213

CRM-M-53584-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 26.09.2025

MAYANK MITTAL

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. A.D.S.Sukhija, Advocate and
Mr. Ish Karan Singh Chhabra, Advocate,
for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.329 dated 30.08.2024, registered under Sections 420, 506 and 120-B IPC (later on Section 409 IPC added), at Police Station Tehsil Camp, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 1 year and 20 days. He started business on 12.06.2024 under the name and style of Shree Vithal Dev Enterprises and as per the allegations, in lieu of the goods supplied to him, an amount of

CRM-M-53584-2025

Rs.41,49,680/- is to be paid to the complainant, for which he is ready either to return the money or the goods, but his godown has been seized by the police on lodging of FIR. He has been falsely implicated in the present case, being brother of co-accused Sanyam Mittal, who has been in the business since the year 2019 and there are certain dues that were pending against him to the complainant as he had not honoured his commitment, but the petitioner has no concern with his business. The above named co-accused has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 09.04.2023, Annexure P-2. The civil dispute has been given a cloak of criminal proceedings. Moreso, he is ready and willing to settle the matter. He is not involved in any other case. Charges have been framed on 03.09.2025 and there are 27 prosecution witnesses. It is a case of magisterial trial.

3. The custody certificate dated 25.09.2025, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year and 20 days.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner alongwith co-accused has cheated the complainant and has complicity with the commission of offence. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

5. Heard.

CRM-M-53584-2025

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 20 days; not involved in any other case; charges stand framed on 03.09.2025 and in all, there are 27 witnesses; the trial is likely to take a considerable time; all the offences are triable by the Magistrate and further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.

CRM-M-53584-2025

- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

26.09.2025

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No