



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-4094-2026
Decided on : 27.04.2026

SURESH KUMAR
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Karanvir Hooda, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.
Ms. Monika Jalota, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Suresh Kumar, aged about 66 years	149	08.05.2025	316(2), 318(4) of BNS (sections 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) and 238 of BNS added later on)	Ambala Cantt.	Ambala



2. As per the case of prosecution, petitioner, a retired Hawaldar from the Indian Air Force, allegedly induced the complainant-Rinku Dhiman, with the promise of securing a peon's job. In furtherance of this assurance, a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- was paid by the complainant to the petitioner and his wife. It is further alleged that a forged appointment/joining letter was handed over to the complainant. Upon scrutiny of the said document, the concerned authorities sought an explanation from the complainant, which led to the revelation that petitioner and his wife had received the aforesaid amount on the pretext of arranging the job. It has also come on record that complainant had raised a loan of Rs.1,50,000/- to arrange the said payment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations are false and fabricated. It is contended that the complainant himself has admitted of paying money for securing employment, thereby implicating himself in an illegal act as reflected in the FIR.

It is further submitted that petitioner is in custody since 31.05.2025, i.e., for a period of approximately 10 months and 26 days. No further recovery is to be effected from him, as the final report has already been presented before the concerned Court.

4. Out of total 9 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far, and therefore, conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant is unable to dispute any of the factual assertion as



stated by counsel for the petitioner today before this Court, including the total incarceration period undergone by the petitioner.

However, learned State counsel submits that apart from the present case, petitioner is involved in three more criminal cases of similar nature. Thus, he submits that petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail in the present case. Hence, present petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

7. Undoubtedly, all the offences alleged against the petitioner are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. Petitioner is in custody since 31.05.2025, i.e., for a period of approximately 10 months and 26 days. Furthermore, nothing remains to be recovered from his possession, as the final report has already been presented before the concerned Court.

Out of total 9 prosecution witnesses, only 01 has been examined so far, and therefore, conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

8. In view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief



Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.04.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO