



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

222

CRM-M-61384-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.12.2025

Raj Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.28 dated 02.03.2025, registered under Section(s) 120-B, 406, 420 (Sections 467, 468, 471, 506 added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Panjokhra, District Ambala.

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that the petitioner, along with his associates, is alleged to have cheated the complainant by dishonestly inducing him to part with a sum of ₹12,00,000/- on the pretext of securing employment for his son in PGI, Chandigarh. It is further alleged that the petitioner issued a forged joining letter and extended threats to kill the complainant. On the basis of these allegations and other ancillary facts, the present FIR was registered, and during the course of investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 16.06.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the primary allegations in the FIR are directed against Nilesh Kumar and Sagar Malik, the latter being the son of the petitioner. It is submitted that only general and

omnibus allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, and that his implication rests on subsequent improvements wherein it was alleged that the complainant had handed over money to him. He contends that there is no averment or allegations against the petitioner for having allured the complainant into securing any job. He submits that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused solely on the fact that the principal accused is his son, who has not been apprehended and the petitioner has thereby been made to bear the brunt of the prosecution. He contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in another case bearing FIR No.27/2025 dated 02.03.2025 registered under Sections 406/420, 120-B, 467, 471, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Panjokhra Sahib, Ambala got lodged by another complainant on similar allegations. After his arrest in that case in May 2025, the petitioner was granted regular bail by the Trial Court vide order dated 08.09.2025. He contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 16.06.2025 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 05 months. He submits that the allegations being identical to those in the earlier FIR and the investigation having already been concluded against the petitioner, his further incarceration and custody is not warranted and the same is not likely to serve any larger public interest. He further submits that the charges were framed on 09.10.2025 and the trial is not expected to conclude in the near future.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State, on the other hand, contends that the allegations against the petitioner are to the effect that he alongwith his co-accused had adduced the complainant to deliver Rs.12 lakhs on the pretext of securing a Govt. job for his son in the PGI,

Chandigarh. She contends that a sum of Rs.4,000/- had been recovered from the petitioner. It is, however, not disputed that charges in the present case were framed only on 09.10.2025 and that the evidence is yet to commence.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, and taking into account the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the nature of the allegations levelled against him, the stage of the trial which is likely to take considerable time to conclude as well as the fact that the case is triable by a Magistrate and bearing in mind that the petitioner has already been granted the concession of regular bail in FIR No. 27/2025 dated 02.03.2025, wherein similar allegations were raised, I deem it fit to allow the present 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

02.12.2025

Mangal Singh

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