

**CRM-M-417-2025 (O&M)****-1-****223 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-417-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.01.2026****NAVREET SINGH ALIAS NAVNEET SINGH
...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA ...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: G.S.Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.272, dated 26.09.2023, under Sections 120-B, 406 and 420 of IPC (later on added offence under Sections 467, 468 and 471 of IPC), registered at Police Station Sadar Rattia, District Fatehabad, Haryana.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Balwinder Singh on the allegations that he wanted to send his son, namely, Akashdeep Singh to Canada on study visa and for the same, he came in contact with Sukhjeet Singh who introduced him further with Maninder Singh and Navreet Singh @ Navneet Singh (present petitioner). They demanded Rs.31,00,000/- for issuing a visa to his son. The complainant paid Rs.11,00,000/- in the account of Maninder Singh and rest of the amount was paid in cash to him. The petitioner and all were alleged to be in connivance with each other. Though, he was issued with the visa but the same was found to be forged.

Thus, the complainant found him to be cheated for an amount of Rs.31,00,000/-.

Neither visa was granted to his son nor his money was returned. The request was

**CRM-M-417-2025 (O&M)****-2-**

made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. The complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation and he was arrested on 14.03.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, trial commenced. He approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad declined the bail application vide order dated 25.07.2024. Thus, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner and whole family has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that as per the allegations, the whole transaction of the alleged amount of Rs.31,00,000/- has taken place with Maninder Singh and not with the petitioner. He further submits that there are total 09 accused, out of which , 08 are on bail including Maninder Singh which whom there is a transaction of money. He further submits that though the petitioner is involved in 06 cases, however, he is on bail in 04 cases. The petitioner is behind bars since 14.03.2024. He further submits that there is no material progress in trial. Thus, in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that out of the total amount Rs.31,00,000/- received by Maninder Singh but Rs.15,00,000/- was transferred in the account of the petitioner and thus, he had played an active role in connivance with the co-accused. He further submits that petitioner is a habitual offender who is involved in 06 other cases. He, on instructions, submits that out of total 37

**CRM-M-417-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

total 09 accused, 08 are on bail. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the transaction as per the allegations was made by the complainant to Maninder Singh. The complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation. He further submits that there are 09 accused persons, out of which, 08 are on bail. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 09 months and 22 days as on 14.01.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner are involved in 06 cases, however, he is on bail in 04 cases. Out of total 37 prosecution witnesses, 10 have been examined

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695** has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in **‘Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024’**, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the

**CRM-M-417-2025 (O&M)****-4-**

right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

10. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the custody and antecedents of the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

15.01.2026

*renubala***(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No