



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

Sr. No.240

CRM-M-16259-2026
Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

RAM PARKASH VERMA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Sitanshu 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 for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 06 dated 03.01.2025, registered under Sections 120-B, 406 and 420 of the IPC, 1860 (corresponding to Sections 61(2), 316 and 318 of BNS, 2023) at Police Station Faridabad Old, District Faridabad (Haryana).

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR has been registered on the complaint of Deepak Kumar alleging that he had purchased land measuring 106.67 square yards in village Kabulpur in the year 2012 from SPR Realtech & Marketing Pvt. Ltd. The accused persons, including the petitioner, had assured that a society would be developed and possession of the plot would be handed over. However, neither the plot was delivered nor the land was transferred in his favour despite payment of approximately ₹4.5 lakhs. It is further alleged that several other persons were similarly cheated. On the basis of the said complaint, FIR under Sections 120-B, 406 and 420 IPC was



registered and during investigation, the petitioner along with other co-accused was arrested. After completion of investigation, the police has filed the final report under the aforesaid sections.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the present case is essentially of civil nature arising out of contractual obligations between the parties and has been wrongly given the colour of criminal proceedings. It is submitted that the petitioner had already resigned from the company on 08.07.2015 and his resignation was duly accepted, thus he had no concern with the alleged transactions in question. It is further contended that the FIR has been lodged after an unexplained delay of about 13 years, which itself creates doubt about the prosecution case.

4. It is also argued that no incriminating material has been recovered from the petitioner and nothing remains to be recovered from him. The petitioner is in custody since 15.12.2025 and the challan has already been presented, therefore, the trial is likely to take considerable time. It is further submitted that the petitioner is 74 years of age, suffering from various ailments and is not a previous convict.

5. Per contra, 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 in the present case and the trial is at an initial stage. However, it is fairly



conceded that as per the custody certificate placed on record, the petitioner is in custody for the last about three months and 17 days.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case. As per the custody certificate placed on record, the petitioner has undergone incarceration for a period of about 3 months and 17 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 learned Magistrate. It is further apparent from the record that none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till date and the trial is likely to take a considerable long time to conclude. 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.

7. 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 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*", 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.

8. Keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, 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 time, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the said Court. The petitioner shall, however, not misuse the concession of bail and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence any witness in any manner.

01.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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