



149+150
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.4678 of 2025

Sanjeev Kumar
..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T., Chandigarh
..... Respondent

CRM-M No.29741 of 2025 (O&M)

Navpreet Sharma
..... Petitioner

versus

State of U.T., Chandigarh
..... Respondent

Date of Decision: 23.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No.4678 of 2025.

Mr. Mukul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M No.29741 of 2025.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor with
Ms. Diksha Sharma, Advocate
for the respondent-UT, Chandigarh.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

CRM-22480-2025 in CRM-M-29741-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Main cases

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two



petitions arising out of the same FIR.

2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.118, dated 21.07.2024, under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station South Sector 34, Chandigarh.

3. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Pramod Kumar against Gazal Kapoor, Global Consultant. It was alleged that Gazal Kapoor was the head of consultancy and she had taken an amount of Rs.1,50,000/- in cash for sending the complainant to Azerbaizan. Gazal Kapoor also issued tickets to the complainant, which were found to be fake tickets. It was alleged that the flight was scheduled for 14.06.2024 but on inquiry, they found that tickets and visa were cancelled. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of both the petitioners, namely, Sanjeev Kumar (in CRM-M-4678-2025) and Navpreet Sharma (in CRM-M-29741-2025) surfaced and, thus, both were also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, both the petitioners were arrested on 16.10.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh declined



the bail applications filed by both the petitioners vide order dated 30.11.2024. Being aggrieved, the petitioner, namely, Sanjeev Kumar earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-61429-2024, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 11.12.2024, whereas the petitioner, namely, Navpreet Sharma earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-62694-2024 and CRM-M-3147-2025, however, the same were dismissed vide orders dated 18.12.2024 and 24.01.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have contended before this Court that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They have submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are regarding alluring the complainant for sending him abroad. They have submitted that the alleged amount of having been received by the petitioners is Rs.9,38,000/-. They have submitted that the petitioners are behind bars from last about 1½ years, however, there is no material progress in the trial.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-4678-2025 has submitted that the petitioner, namely, Sanjeev Kumar has been clandestinely roped in the present case during the investigation.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that though the petitioners are involved in one more case, however, they are on bail in that case. They have submitted that till date, only 02 witnesses have been examined and thus, their right of speedy trial has been



miserably defeated. They have further submitted that the trial would take sufficiently long time for its disposal as it being the Magisterial trial. They have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

7. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners in connivance with each other have duped the victims and an amount of Rs.9,38,000/- has been taken by the petitioners in the account of their servant, namely, Shubham. He has submitted that during the investigation, complicity of both the petitioners has been established. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.

8. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

9. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners in the present case were arrested on 16.10.2024. The transaction of the amount, as contended before this Court, is in the account of one Shubham and not in the account of the petitioners. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioners have suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 05 months and 07 days as on 22.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioners are involved in one more case, however, only the petitioner, namely, Sanjeev Kumar is on bail in that case. Out of total 17 prosecution



witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far.

10. 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

11. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and all the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, if the petitioner, namely, Navpreet Sharma (in CRM-M-29741-2025) does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

12. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

23.03.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No