

CRM-M-22795-2026

2026:PHHC:066137



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

CRM-M-22795-2026

NEERAJ SHARMA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

Date of decision: April 29, 2026

Date of Uploading: April 30, 2026

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Salman Ahmed, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 229 dated 09.09.2024, under Sections 409, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of the IPC registered at Police Station Udyog Vihar, Gurugram.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

CRM-M-22795-2026

“Legal Action Required Against INR 4 Crore Scam by Railworld India Pvt. Ltd. Respected Cabinet Minister. I am writing to bring to your urgent attention a case of fraudulent activities conducted by Railworld India Pvt. Ltd. This company, which allegedly employs 1200 individuals, has engaged in deceptive practices that have led to significant financial and professional harm to its employees. Details of the Fraudulent Practices: Security Bond Collection: Railworld India Pvt. Ltd. required each employee to pay a security bond ranging from INR 30,000 to 45,000, promising that salaries would commence after 100 working days. However, the company disappeared after approximately 70 working days, leaving employees unpaid. -Employment Structure. The company began employing individuals from March 11, organizing them into different groups. Some employees were instructed to work on-site at various branches, while others worked remotely. Despite this, all employees were subject to the same fraudulent bond requirement. Locations and Key Personnel:(SECTION 173 OF BNS) Railworld India Pvt Ltd operates branches in Indore, Pune, Hyderabad, Raipur, Gurgaon, and Delhi. The Indore branch, led by HR Manager Mangla Parihar, and trainers Shivam Mishra and Ashish Dwivedi, managed the recruitment process. The company's CEO and key figures include Prakash Singh, Amit Kumar, and Ranvijay Singh. Estimated Scam Amount: The total estimated amount of the scam is around INR 4 crores, collected from employees under the guise of a security bond Additional Concerns: Mental and Financial Distress: The company's fraudulent actions have caused significant mental and financial distress to all employees. By collecting security deposits and subsequently shutting down, the company has exacerbated the employees' hardships. Request for Ministry's Action: 1. Investigation: Conduct a thorough investigation into the business practices of Railworld India Pvt Ltd, focusing on the legitimacy of their operations and their disappearance. 2.Preventive Measures: Implement measures to protect current and future employees from such exploitative schemes, including public warnings and stricter regulations for companies demanding security bonds. 3. Accountability and Compensation: Take legal action against Railworld India Pvt Ltd and its authorized representatives to ensure that the employees' security deposits are returned and appropriate penalties are imposed for their fraudulent activities. The gravity of this situation necessitates immediate intervention to prevent further exploitation and to provide justice to those already Thank you for your prompt attention to this critical matter. Sincerely, Jai Bharat 919350093219 Attachments: 1. Transaction details 2. Evidence of security bond demands 3. Offer letter12257/CP/24/EML DT 19.06.20244056-P DT 20.06.2024 5783-DW DT. After investigation of 02.09.2024 by Economic Offences Branch-2

CRM-M-22795-2026

Gurugram, the complaint along with the attached documents were received in the police station through proper channel for registration of case as per serial number 2192-93/P/DCP-EAST DATED 02.09.2024. On the basis of the essence of the complaint and investigation, it was found that the crime under sections 409,420,120B IPC had been committed, case number 229 dated 09.09.2024 under sections 409,420,120B IPC was registered at Udyog Vihar police station and copies of FIR were prepared through computer on CCTNS. Which will be sent to the area magistrate and higher officials through post. After registering the above mentioned case, a copy has been kept in the police file, whose investigation will be carried out in future. The above mentioned case is being registered in the presence of ASI Jai Bhagwan no. 551/GGM. After registering the above charge, the file of the above charge will be sent to EOW-2 Gurugram for further investigation.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 30.07.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner is neither the CEO nor the Director of the Company in question. Learned counsel has further iterated that the trial emanating from the FIR is magisterial one. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner has suffered incarceration for more than 09 months. Learned counsel has iterated that the petitioner is man aged 43 years with clean antecedents and sole bread earner. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 28.04.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

CRM-M-22795-2026

6. The petitioner was arrested on 30.07.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 09.09.2025. Total 13 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which only eight have been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Criminal Appeal No.2787 of 2024** titled as **Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh vs. State of Maharashtra and another**, decided on 03.07.2024; relevant whereof reads as under:-

“19 If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.

20. We may hasten to add that the petitioner is still an accused; not a convict. The over-arching postulate of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty cannot be brushed aside lightly. howsoever stringent the penal law may be.

21. We are convinced that the manner in which the prosecuting agency as well as the Court have proceeded, the right of the accused to have a speedy trial could be said to have been infringed thereby violating Article 21 of the Constitution.”

The rival contention raised at par give rise to debatable issues which shall essentially be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought

CRM-M-22795-2026

forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 28.04.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 09 months and 01 day. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before

CRM-M-22795-2026

the trial.

(iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.

(v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.

(vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.

(vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

(viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

(ix) The petitioner shall be required to deposit either the cash surety or bank guarantee to the tune of Rs.1,00,000/- in favor of the Court releasing him on regular bail.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

CRM-M-22795-2026

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

April 29, 2026

rts

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No