



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-54403-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.11.2025

Varun Juneja

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Akshit Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.283 dated 15.11.2022, registered under Section(s) 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station New Colony, Gurugram.

2. Briefly summarized, the allegations levelled in the FIR (as mentioned in para No.1 of the petition) reads thus:-

“1. Xxxxxxxx As per the allegations levelled in the FIR by the complainant, it was alleged that she purchased a house bearing ID No. 93C76U34Z, House No. 280/4, Committee No. 458/14, measuring 136.25 sq. yards, from Smt. Rekha Devi for a consideration of ₹1,10,00,000/- Rekha Devi represented herself as the owner under Vasika No. 13049 dated 04.12.2018, claiming she had purchased it from Smt. Pawan Kumari and that no loan was pending on the property. On this assurance, the complainant paid ₹11,00,000/- (RTGS on 14.01.2022), ₹50,87,500/- (28.07.2022), and ₹47,50,000/- (29.07.2022), and the property was ultimately registered in her



name through Vasika No. 5624. Subsequently, the complainant received a notice from Cholamandalam Investment and Finance Company Ltd., revealing that the property stood mortgaged in the names of Varun, Om, Naveen, Pawan Kumar and Vinod, with an outstanding loan of 21,38,97,824/- plus interest. The complainant alleged that this fact was concealed, and when questioned, the co-accused (Rekha Devi) failed to give a satisfactory reply and allegedly used abusive language.... xxxxxxxxx”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has been in custody since 11.11.2024 and has undergone an actual custody of nearly 01 year. It is submitted that the investigation in the matter already stands concluded and no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Moreover, even if the allegations are taken at their face value, they merely indicate that the petitioner was a co-borrower in respect of a loan obtained against the property in question, and that the dispute essentially pertains to issues concerning title of the said property. It is further submitted that other co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail after taking into consideration the ratio of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar and another**' reported as **(2014) 8 SCC 273**. He submits that only 08 out of the total 13 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. It is also not in dispute that there were certain other



210 CRM-M-54403-2025 (O&M)

cases registered against the petitioner under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Shivaji Nagar, Gurugram, however, the petitioner already stood discharged in those cases.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner and that there is no allegation of forgery of documents and that, at best, the petitioner’s role is limited to that of a co-borrower, the stage of the trial and the fact that the same is likely to take a long time to conclude and bearing in mind that all other co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail, on the strength thereof, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness 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

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

12.11.2025
Mangal Singh

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