



CRM-M-21604-2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-21604-2026

Date of decision : 05.05.2026

AMIT KUMAR TYAGI

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate,
Mr. R.S. Bagga, Advocate and
Mr. Akash Balyan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023(erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.), in case FIR No.683 dated 27.11.2025, registered under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 IPC (Section 120B IPC deleted later on), Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 and Sections 21 & 22 of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Scheme Act, 2019, (corresponding Sections 61(2), 316(2), 318(4) of BNS), at Police Station Sector 32-33, Karnal, District Karnal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant-Vijay Pal, was allegedly induced by the petitioner to invest money in a company namely "A to Z Company". It is alleged that the petitioner assured the complainant that he

**CRM-M-21604-2026****-2-**

will get returns ranging from 10% to 30% on his investment by forming a team on the aforesaid gaming platform. It is further alleged that the complainant also invested in 'UIFC Coin' (Crypto Company) on the assurance of the petitioner to get profit of 15% per month. It is also alleged that the petitioner had allegedly defrauded the complainant to the tune of Rs.64 lakhs. The complainant is also alleged to have been called by the petitioner to Dubai but he returned to India without getting his money back.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the matter is entirely civil in nature and initially, an enquiry was conducted in which the petitioner was found innocent. It is submitted that there is no evidence to show that any money was ever transferred or credited into the account of the petitioner. It is further submitted that on the similar set of allegations, four FIR(s) including FIR No.476 dated 02.08.2025 have been registered against the petitioner by different complainants. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the petitioner has already been granted bail in FIR No.476 dated 02.08.2025 by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-14573-2026, on 25.03.2026 (Annexure P-2) which was initially lodged and thereafter, subsequent FIR(s) were registered against him on similar set of allegations. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 05 months and 02 days. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as only challan has been presented but charges are yet to be framed.

4. Notice of motion.

**CRM-M-21604-2026****-3-**

5. On the asking of this Court, Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State and has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 05 months and 02 days. He, upon instructions, submits that only challan has been presented but charges are yet to be framed.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 05 months and 02 days; the matter is purely civil in nature, during preliminary enquiry, he was stated to be found innocent, he has already been granted bail in one of the FIR(s) which was registered on the similar set of allegations, and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as only challan has been presented but charges are yet to be framed, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



CRM-M-21604-2026

-4-

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 05, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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