



CRM-M-9332-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

212

**CRM-M-9332-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 29.05.2026**

ANKUSH NAIN ALIAS ABHIYANT SANDHU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Pardeep Solath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Yogesh Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS') seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.261 dated 08.09.2025 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNS'), registered at Police Station Civil Line, District Kaithal.

2. Allegations qua the petitioner are that the petitioner induced the complainant to enhance production on assurance of higher payments and supply of raw material. It is alleged that thereafter petitioner failed



to honour the terms of agreement and embezzled an amount of Rs.33.84 lakh by playing fraud with the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for grant of concession of regular bail on the following grounds:

(I) That petitioner has been falsely implicated in a criminal case by way of present FIR as the dispute between the parties is of civil nature arising out of a business transaction;

(II) That the petitioner intended to honour the terms of the agreement but due to the petitioner's arrest, his business collapsed and he failed to honour his business commitments;

(III) That the present petitioner has been in custody since 17.11.2025, i.e. for the last more than 06 months;

(IV) That investigation in the present case has already been completed and charges have been framed and the case is now fixed for prosecution evidence and

(V) That trial will take sufficient time to conclude and as such, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars for indefinite period;

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the grant of concession of regular bail on the following grounds:



- (I) That the petitioner has cheated the complainant to the tune of Rs.33.84 lakh;
- (II) That the petitioner collected the security amount, supplied the raw material and later on backed out from his business commitments;
- (III) That the petitioner disclosed the manner of commission of offence in his disclosure statement, pursuant to which, an amount of Rs.20,000/- was recovered from him and
- (IV) That the petitioner is not having clean antecedents as he is involved in 8 other cases of similar nature.

It is, however, fairly admitted that the investigation has already been completed.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant contended that the present petitioner duped/ cheated the complainant to the tune of Rs.50.00 lakh on a false promise and received a security amount but did not enter into an agreement with him and on similar basis, he also cheated some other persons in the name of entering into the business and did not enter into agreement regarding terms and conditions of business, which shows that his representations were not bona fide.

7. In order to refute the aforesaid contentions raised by learned counsel for the complainant, learned counsel for the petitioner placed on record a copy of agreement entered regarding his business with other persons which is taken on record.



8. Heard.

9. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the present case, the rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds merit in the present petition on the following aspects:

(I) the present petitioner has been in custody since 17.11.2025 i.e for the last more than 06 months;

(II) investigation in the present case has been completed and charges have been framed;

(III) the matter pertains to business dealings between the parties and

(IV) the trial is at prosecution stage and is likely to take sufficient time to conclude and as such, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for indefinite period.

10. Concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

11. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the



CRM-M-9332-2026 (O&M) -5-

satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

Sonia Puri

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