



CRM-M-2731-2026

::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(111+211)

Date of decision: 22.04.2026

CRM-M-2731-2026

Namrita Aery

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CRM-M-17484-2026 (O&M)

Vikrant Aery @ Vikrant Sharma

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Shailender Singh, Advocate,
Ms. Priya Bhati, Advocate and
Mr. Vikas Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

CRM-17032-2026 in CRM-M-17484-2026

This is an application under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 is for correction in the head note and prayer clause of the main petition i.e. CRM-M-17484-2026 by substituting the word “First Bail petition” with Second Bail Petition” and for placing on record the Amended Petition as Annexure P-7 and the first bail dismissal order as Annexure P-8.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. The words “First Bail Petition” in the head note as well as in the prayer clause of the main petition i.e. CRM-M-17484-2026 shall be read as

“Second Bail Petition” and Annexures P-7 and P-8 are taken on record.

**CRM-M-2731-2026****::2::****CRM-M-2731-2026 & CRM-M-17484-2026**

The prayer in these petitions under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioners in FIR No.2 dated 01.01.2025 under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 10, 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983 added later on registered at Police Station Yamuna Nagar City, District Yamuna Nagar, Haryana.

2. As per the prosecution case, the petitioners received a sum of Rs.26,00,000 to send the complainant to Canada. However, after receiving the money, the complainant was not sent to Canada.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They have now been in custody since 10.03.2025 and only 04 of the 12 prosecution witnesses have been examined, including the material witnesses. As the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate, they are entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, has filed a reply dated 20.04.2026, which is taken on record. While referring to the said reply, he contends that a sum of Rs.20,00,000/- was paid into the account of petitioner-Namrita Aery and Rs.6,00,000/- was paid in cash to petitioner-Vikrant Aery @ Vikrant Sharma. However, the complainant was not sent abroad. Additionally, the petitioners are accused in two other cases of a similar nature and are facing numerous complaints, where the allegations levelled against them are somewhat similar. Therefore, the petitioners are not entitled to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the

petitioners have now been in custody since 10.03.2025, that 04 of the 12

**CRM-M-2731-2026****::3::**

prosecution witnesses have been examined, including the material witnesses and that the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. This Court in the case titled as ***Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab bearing CRM-M24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022*** has held as under:-

“Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts) , in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”

7. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioners and their co-accused shall be adjudicated during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioners are in custody since 10.03.2026 but only 04 of the 12 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. The present case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and no serious apprehension has been expressed by the State that the petitioners would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses if granted the concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioners is not required.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the presents petitions are allowed and the petitioners, namely, Namrita Aery and



CRM-M-2731-2026

::4::

Vikrant Aery @ Vikrant Sharma are ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

- 9. The present petitions stand disposed of.
- 10. The petitioners shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that they are not involved in any other crime other than the cases mentioned in this order.
- 11. In addition, the petitioners (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- each and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause.
- 12. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.
- 13. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

April 22, 2026
kusum

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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