



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.226

CRM-M-12308-2026
Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

RAM PARKASH VERMA ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Jai Bhagwan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 238 dated 04.07.2024, registered under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 IPC (corresponding to Sections 61(2), 316, 318 of the BNS, 2023) at Police Station Faridabad Old, District Faridabad (Haryana).
2. Brief facts of the present case are that the complainant Sher Singh and others submitted a complaint dated 03.10.2023 before the Commissioner of Police, Faridabad against SPR Realtech Marketing Pvt. Ltd., Sai Township & Sai Vatika Realtech and their owners, namely Satish Chopra, Pawan Gupta, Ranveer Singh, Samarpal Dagar and Ram Prakash Verma, alleging commission of cheating and forgery. It was alleged that the complainants had purchased plots from the said companies through GPA and full and final agreements in the year 2012, however, possession of the plots



was not delivered to them. On the basis of the said complaint, the present FIR under Sections 120-B, 406 and 420 IPC was registered. During investigation, the accused persons including the present petitioner were arrested and, upon completion of investigation, the final report was filed before the competent Court. The petitioner is in custody since 01.11.2025 and has filed the present petition seeking regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner resigned as Director of SPR Realtech & Marketing Pvt. Ltd. on 08.07.2015, which was duly accepted, and he has not been associated with the company thereafter. The company had already delivered possession of the alleged plots, as affirmed by affidavits of the complainant and other buyers. The petitioner is in custody since 30.10.2025, and his regular bail application was dismissed by the Trial Court, Faridabad, on 09.02.2026. It is further contended that multiple FIRs have been lodged on the same cause of action, and the petitioner has already been granted bail in two such FIRs. On these grounds, it is prayed that the petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner involving cheating and misappropriation of money from innocent persons. It is further contended that there are multiple FIRs pending against the petitioner of similar nature, which reflects his involvement in such activities. It is also submitted that material witnesses are yet to be examined and the trial is at an initial stage. Learned State counsel further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last six months.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case. The petitioner has undergone custody of five months and four days. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner is aged about 74 years. The offences alleged in the present case are triable by the Magistrate. It is further apparent from the record that not much progress has been made in this case, as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till date and the trial is likely to take considerable time. The allegations, though serious in nature, primarily arise out of a transaction which appears to have predominantly civil overtones. The culpability of the petitioner is yet to be established during the course of trial. Continued incarceration of the petitioner, particularly in the given facts and circumstances and considering his advanced age, would not serve any useful purpose.

6. So far as the contention of the State regarding involvement of the petitioner in other similar cases is concerned, the same by itself cannot be made a ground to decline the concession of bail in the present case. In this regard, reliance can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012(2) SCC 382* wherein it has been held that merely on the basis of involvement in other cases, the benefit of bail cannot be declined and each case has to be considered on its own merits.

7. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances, the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, his age, the fact that no prosecution witness has been examined so far and the trial is likely to take

some time, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

07.04.2026

Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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