



CRM-M-53545-2025 (O&M)

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-53545-2025 (O&M)****Reserved on : 26.09.2025****Pronounced on : 29.09.2025**

Ishwar Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, A.A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 179, 180, 205, 318(4), 324(4), 338 and 341(1) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the FIR No.154 dated 17.04.2025 has been lodged in Police Station Civil Lines Sirsa, District Sirsa. The petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of abovementioned offence and he has been arrested. The petitioner is in custody since 18.04.2025 and, therefore, craving for bail. This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the abovementioned FIR came into being on a complaint of Naresh, hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was alleged by the complainant that 15-20 days prior to FIR, he was at Sirsa Bus-Stand, where a person, who

**CRM-M-53545-2025 (O&M)**

2

introduced himself to be Vijay Kumar S/o Charan Dass, R/o Khanna Colony, Sirsa, met and indulged with him in usual conversation, disclosing therein that he along with Ishwar Singh (petitioner) was working in a company and their job was to seek investment for the company, which would be doubled on the spot itself. According to complainant, Vijay Kumar had invited him in the next meeting of the company and thereafter, Vijay Kumar shared his WhatsApp number, i.e. 90393-60165, with him.

3. It is the case of the complainant that thereafter, he was in constant touch with Vijay Kumar and his friend Ishwar Singh, through the abovementioned mobile number, through WhatsApp call, and that 2-3 days prior to FIR, when he told Vijay Kumar that he (complainant) had procured money for doubling, he was called on a road leading from Sirsa Bus-Stand to Maharana Pratap Chowk. According to complainant, it was told by Vijay Kumar and Ishwar Singh that they were in white colour Swift Dzire bearing registration No.RJ31-J-5927.

4. The complainant had further alleged that when he was going towards Maharana Pratap Chowk, Vijay Kumar met him in the abovementioned car and he introduced another occupant of the car as his friend, namely Ishwar Singh. According to complainant, in the car he gave Rs.10,000/- to Vijay Kumar and thereafter, Vijay Kumar gave him two bundles of currency notes of the denomination of Rs.100/- each (total Rs.20,000/-). As per complainant, after receiving money he got down from the car, and Vijay Kumar and Ishwar Singh left towards Maharana Pratap Chowk. It had been further alleged by the complainant that after some time,

**CRM-M-53545-2025 (O&M)**

3

when he checked the abovementioned currency notes, he found that the notes handed over to him were not genuine.

5. According to prosecution, in response to abovementioned complaint, formal FIR in this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. During the course of investigation, the petitioner was arrested.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that in the present case, the petitioner is facing protracted incarceration, as he is in custody for a period of more than 05 months, and that the major role with regard to commission of offence has been attributed to the co-accused Vijay Kumar, who has already been enlarged on bail by the learned trial Court. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the identity of petitioner as co-accused is yet to be established in the present case, and that the petitioner was neither involved in alleged allurement of the complainant, nor he had called the complainant to pay money. In addition to above, it has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail on parity also.

8. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail on the ground of parity, as this question has already been discussed in detail by the learned trial Court, wherein it has been observed that bail to the co-accused Vijay Kumar has been granted only on account of his special prevailing condition, and his past criminal

**CRM-M-53545-2025 (O&M)**

4

history. The learned State Counsel has further argued that since the petitioner is a habitual offender, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that the petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 171 of IPC in five cases. In addition to above, he is separately being prosecuted in two cases for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC. The details of all these cases have been placed on record as a part of custody certificate. The abovementioned details show that in addition to present case, the petitioner is facing 09 other prosecutions for various offences ranging from attempt to murder, forgery and impersonation.

11. As far as the present case is concerned, there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that he indulged into conversation through WhatsApp calls with the complainant, and prompted him to pay Rs.10,000/- in the name of doubling the same. In addition to above, at the time of payment of money, when the complainant was duped, the petitioner was travelling in the same car and he played active role in convincing the complainant to pay money. Thus, the petitioner cannot shy away from the responsibility with regard to commission of abovementioned crime.

12. In view of abovementioned cumulative effect of the facts and circumstances of the present case, it is hereby held that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail on the ground of parity.



13. As a sequel of abovementioned observations, it is hereby observed that the present petition is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

14. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 29, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

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