

2026 PHHC 073582



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

242

CRM-M-25429-2026

Date of decision: 11th May, 2026

Neeraj Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Randeep Singh Dhakla, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Simranpreet Singh Sambhi, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

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. 39 dated 28.02.2026 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of IPC (Sections 465, 468 and 471 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint moved by the complainant Chandgi Ram, alleging that the accused Satish Kumar had told him that his son Neeraj, i.e. the present petitioner was engaged in the business of sending public persons abroad and was running an office at Kurukshetra. The complainant was interested to send his son to Australia on study Visa. He met the present petitioner, who induced him to part with a sum of Rs. 12,02,500/- on the premise of sending his son to Australia on study visa. However, neither his son was sent abroad, nor the

2026 PHHC 073582



money as paid by him had been returned to the complainant and when the complainant raised demand of the same, the petitioner stopped picking up his calls. By alleging that he had been cheated and defrauded by the petitioner and co-accused, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 17.04.2026. Investigation qua him now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 17.04.2026. He is not required for further investigation. A compromise has been arrived at between the petitioner and the complainant and a petition seeking quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise has also been filed before this Court, which is pending. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. At this stage, Mr. Simranpreet Singh Sambhi, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant and has filed power of attorney. He has affirmed the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the parties and has placed on record a copy of order dated 06.05.2026 passed by this Court in a petition as filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR. Learned State counsel has, however, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned

2026 PHHC 073582



counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have caused wrongful loss to the tune of Rs. 12,02,500/- to the complainant. He is in custody since 17.04.2026. He is not required for further investigation. A petition seeking quashing of FIR by way of compromise is pending. Though the allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of the aforementioned offences as against the petitioner, however, taking into consideration the period spent by the petitioner in custody, the pendency of petition for quashing of FIR, the fact that the subject offences are triable by Magistrate and further pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

11th May, 2026

Parveen Sharma

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned
- 2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No
: Yes / No