



CRM-M-3748-2026

-1-

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

205

CRM-M-3748-2026

Date of decision : 24.04.2026

RAJ LOHIYA

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. K.D.S. Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023(erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.), in case FIR No. 253, dated 27.10.2023, under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC (Sections 419, 204 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sushant Lok, District Gurugram.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with co-accused Nishant Saxena and Divanshu, in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy, allegedly cheated the complainant to the tune of Rs.2,08,87,798/-. They are alleged to have opened various bank accounts in HSBC Bank in the name of Nishank Jain, whereas the actual person was Nishant Saxena and one account was also opened in the name of the petitioner by forged identify proofs. The petitioner is further alleged to have applied for multiple credit

**CRM-M-3748-2026****-2-**

cards and obtained a personal loan of Rs.9 lakhs, whereas co-accused Nishant Saxena allegedly withdrew Rs.20 lakhs from the said bank account.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that co-accused Nishant Saxena has already been granted bail by this Court in CRM-M-4344-2025 on 03.02.2025 (Annexure P-2). It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 01 month and 29 days and is not involved in any other case. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as only 01 out of 29 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State and has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 01 month and 29 days and is not involved in any other case. He, upon instructions, submits that only 01 out of 29 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 01 month and 29 days, he is not involved in any other case,

**CRM-M-3748-2026****-3-**

co-accused has already been granted bail and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as only 01 out of 29 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

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

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

April 24, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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