



208

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

CRM-M-15009-2026

Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

Sayed Mohd. Bilal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**Present:** Ms. Neha Bindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Khalid Tauru, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for grant of bail in case FIR No.0169 dated 15.04.2025 under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120-B & 201 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Sohna, Gurugram, Haryana.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Aslam Khan @ Jabir (complainant) wherein it was alleged that he was doing the work of Cyber Cafe and in March 2023, he met Syed Mohd. Bilal (petitioner herein). It was alleged that Bilal told him that he is doing the work of trading in the share market through his firm, namely, Zehan Enterprises and made the complainant and his friends invest in the same and the complainant invested Rs.20,16,900/- in the trading. Bilal assured him that the money is completely safe and he will earn good money from this work. Thereafter, when the complainant along with his friends went to his house, he was not there and on enquiry it was found that he has committed fraud by using his fake addresses and documents. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. After the registration of the FIR, investigation



commenced. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, trial commenced. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram declined the bail application vide order dated 05.03.2026. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She submits that as per the allegations, the complainant with his free consent has invested in the Firm/company opened by the petitioner. It is submitted that thereafter the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. She submits that in the present case, investigation is already complete and charges are also framed. To buttress her arguments, she submits that both the sides have amicably resolved their outstanding issues by way of amicable settlement. She thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has affirmed the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that though the FIR was registered by him, however, he has already resolved the issues by way of compromise arrived between the petitioner and the complainant.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She submits that the complicity of the petitioner is duly established during the investigation. She submits that the petitioner had duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.20,16,900/-. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, only 1 witness has been examined so far. However, she has endorsed the fact that the parties have entered into compromise.



6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the complainant has lodged the FIR against the petitioner that he has been duped for an amount of Rs.20,16,900/-. However, it has been affirmed before this Court that the matter has already been compromised between the parties. The charges are also framed. Out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, only 1 witness has been examined so far. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone incarceration of 10 months and 04 days as on 23.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases.
7. 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.
8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.
9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

24.03.2026
ps-I

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE
:Yes/No
:Yes/No