



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

(209)

CRM-M-69227-2025(O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: 12.12.2025

Naresh Kumar and another

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.K.S.Nalwa, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Vishmaad S. Bajwa, Advocate,
Mr. Ashmeet K. Shah, Advocate and
Ms. Ashima Attri, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

Mr.Amit Chaudhary, Advocate, for complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioners are seeking regular bail in FIR No.0264 dated 04.09.2025, under Sections 120-B, 418, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Ballabhgarh Sadar, Faridabad.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the case of the present petitioners is on the same footings to that of co-accused Anand Vallabha Dhyani, who has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 04.12.2025, passed in CRM-M-66982-2025.
3. Notice of motion.



4. On advance notice, Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Asstt.AG, Haryana, appears and accepted notice on behalf of respondent/State, filed custody certificates of the petitioners and on instructions from SI Manoj Kumar has submitted that the case of the petitioners is on the same footings to that of co-accused Anand Vallabha Dhyani; petitioners are in custody for the last more than two months and investigation qua them has already been completed.

5. On behalf of respondent/complainant Mr. Amit Chaudhary, appeared and filed *vakalatnama*, same is taken on record and opposed the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners but not disputed the fact that the case of the present petitioners is on the same footing to that of co-accused Anand Vallabha Dhyani.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the fact that the case of the petitioners is on the same footing to that of co-accused Anand Vallabha Dhyani; the allegations in the F.I.R. are yet to be established; the offences are triable by Magistrate; the present petitioners are in custody for the last more than two months; the petitioners have already been remanded to judicial custody and are not required for custodial interrogation; their antecedents are clean and clear, and except the present case, they are not involved in any other case; the present case is based on documentary evidence, and there is no apprehension that after release, they will hamper the investigation; concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure of punishment as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and it is trite



hence, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

12.12.2025

mamta

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(SUBHAS MEHLA)

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No