



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

111+222

CRM-6853-2025 in/and
CRM-M-56747-2024
Date of decision: May 21st, 2025

Sandeep Shekhawat

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-6853-2025

Prayer in this application is for placing on record disclosure
statement of petitioner as Annexure P-13.

Application is allowed subject to just exceptions.

Annexure P-13 is taken on record.

CRM-M-56747-2024

Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in
FIR No.15 dated 02.02.2024 under Sections
420/467/468/471/120-B/180 of the IPC registered at Police Station
Satnali, District Mahendergarh.

2. Mr. Lakshay Jindal, Advocate, has entered appearance on
behalf of the complainant and filed his power of attorney, which is taken
on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in a magisterial trial, the petitioner has been in custody for the past more than one year having been arrested on 04.03.2024. It has been contended that after the challan was presented qua the petitioner on 01.06.2024, no progress had taken place before the trial Court as even charges had not yet been framed. Hence, in the circumstances, more so when as many as 23 witnesses had been cited by the prosecution, the possibility of the trial concluding did not arise. It has further been submitted that the entire case of the prosecution hinges on documentary evidence, which is already part of the charge sheet and, therefore, in case the petitioner is admitted to bail, there can be no apprehension of the petitioner tampering with material evidence.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has, however, opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR in question, which has been annexed as Annexure P-2. It has been submitted that the petitioner had played a huge fraud upon the complainant party by obtaining loan against some non-existent houses as well as other fake documents. However, on instructions, it has not been disputed that investigation is complete qua the petitioner and even challan stands presented.

5. On a pointed query as to the reason behind the non-progress of the trial after the challan was presented on 01.06.2024, it has been contended that it is on account of some of the other co-accused still being at large.

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

7. The petitioner, in a magisterial trial, has been in custody since 04.03.2024. The entire case of the prosecution rests on documentary evidence, which is already part of the challan. Therefore, there can be no apprehension of the petitioner tampering with material evidence. The trial is going to take considerable time to conclude.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. 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.

9. 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