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

2026:PHHC:079946

211 **CRM-M-18950-2026 (O&M)**
Date of decision:20.05.2026

Harmail Singh ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Tarunveer Vashist, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. At the very outset, on oral request made by learned counsel for the petitioner, offences punishable under Sections 201, 467 and 468 of IPC are ordered to be incorporated in the head note of the petition.

2. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.124 dated 09.07.2026, registered under Sections 420, 409 of IPC (offences under Sections 201, 467 and 468 of IPC were added lateron), at Police Station City Dhuri, District Sangrur.

3. As per the allegations, on a complaint moved by complainant – Rupahill Sikka, Manager, Regional Office, Punjab Gramin Bank, Sangrur against the petitioner, an inquiry was conducted by the police and it transpired

that one Pardeep Singh was promoted to the post of Clerk on 01.04.2024 and was transferred on promotion from branch Bhalwan to branch Dhuri. He had not been imparted any departmental training enabling him to efficiently discharge duties attached to the post of Clerk. The present petitioner, who was posted as a Manager took undue advantage of this fact and by taking the above named Pardeep Singh into confidence, used his official ID as well as computer system for carrying out bank transactions. He used the IDs and passwords of other employees of the bank as well without their knowledge and consent and obtained loans against amounts lying deposited in the bank accounts of several customers. The said amount was thereafter diverted and embezzled by the petitioner by way of investment in some other banks. It was revealed that the petitioner himself used to process loan applications, verified the same and then used to withdraw the loan amounts taking advantage of the fact that the Clerk Pardeep Singh was not aware of such transactions and had no technical knowledge regarding functioning of the system. By doing so, the petitioner was alleged to have embezzled an amount of Rs.2,29,94,231.57/-. A case under Sections 420 and 409 of IPC was accordingly registered against the present petitioner. He was arrested on 12.12.2025. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. The case is based on documentary evidence. The investigation stands completed. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The subject offences are triable by the Magistrate. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel, while relying upon the status

report, has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the custody certificate, he is involved in one more case of similar nature. He had embezzled a huge amount of money from the bank by himself using the trust reposed upon him. There are chances of his intimidating the witnesses, tampering with the evidence, committing similar offences or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. It is, thus, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have criminally misappropriated a huge amount of money from the bank in which he was employed as a Manager by operating the user IDs and passwords of other bank employees for the purpose of unauthorized withdrawal of funds, by moving loan applications in the name of different customers of the bank and utilizing the said amount of money by converting the same to his own use and by creating forged and fabricated electronic record and documents. The allegations against him are quite serious in nature. The case is at its nascent stage. The antecedents of the petitioner are also not clean. The apprehension that he may tamper with the record or intimidate the witnesses cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. It is well settled proposition of law that while considering prayer made by an accused for grant of bail, the Court has to consider the nature of offence(s), the role of the petitioner, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses and likelihood of fleeing justice. The Courts are required to be guided by consideration such as nature and gravity of the offences and the other facts of the case. Taking into consideration the

serious nature of the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, this Court of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

20.05.2026

harjeet

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