



CRM-M-18083-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-18083-2026

Date of Decision: 09.04.2026

Harpreet Singh @ Sonu Walia

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Kuljit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuljinder Dhindsa, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.180 dated 01.07.2024, registered under Sections 420 IPC, at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Harvinder Singh. It was alleged that on 02.07.2021, 02.08.2021 and 25.08.2021, Sonu Walia (petitioner) took three cheques of Rs.40,000/-, Rs.30,000/- and Rs.70,000/-, total amounting to Rs.1,40,000/- from the complainant for providing him job. However, neither the job was provided to the complainant nor his money was returned. On asking, the petitioner returned him Rs.40,000/-, but remaining Rs.1 lac is still not paid to the complainant. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused person. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the petitioner was arrested on 25.06.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 05.03.2026. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of



CRM-M-18083-2026

-2-

filing the present petition

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that evidently, the petitioner has been roped in the present case on the false and frivolous allegations. He contends that as per the case of the prosecution, the complainant had given the petitioner three cheques for an amount of Rs.1,40,000/-. He further contends that out of this amount, the petitioner has already paid Rs.40,000/- to the complainant. It is contended that the dispute allegedly is only for the transaction of amount, for which an FIR is not itself maintainable. He further vehemently contends that the petitioner has been falsely roped in other cases as well, however, he is on bail in majority of the cases. He further contends that the petitioner is behind the bars since 25.06.2025, but his custody is being counted in other case, therefore, in the present case, his custody is shown to be only for two months. He submits that there is also no material progress in the trial, though the petitioner is behind the bars since 25.06.2026. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who has been convicted in number of cases. On instructions, he submits that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses have been examined and 02 witnesses have been given up so far. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute between the petitioner and the complainant is regarding transaction of amount. It has been contended before this Court that



CRM-M-18083-2026

-3-

out of total amount of Rs.1,40,000/-, the petitioner has already paid Rs.40,000/-. The custody certificate shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 month & 30 days on 24.08.2025. However, it is an admitted fact that the petitioner is behind the bars since 25.06.2026 in this case. Custody certificate of the petitioner further shows that the petitioner is involved in 17 other cases. Out of 11 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses have been examined and 02 witnesses have been given up.

6. 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. 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 counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

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

8. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

09.04.2026

sharmila

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