

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

230

CRM-M-27951-2026

Date of decision :21.05.2026

Date of uploading :22.05.2026

K. Shailendra Pratap Singh Alias Shailesh PratapPetitioner**Versus****State Of Haryana And Another****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

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


Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sayyam Garg, Advocate for respondent No.2.


SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present 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.50 dated 26.02.2025 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 170 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, District Faridabad.

2. This FIR is registered on the written application, filed by the complainant Sunil Mehra, Director of M/s Campari Export Pvt. Ltd. with the allegations that his company is a Government recognized Star Export House, which is dealing with manufacturing facilities in Faridabad and they have been in business since 1989. It is further alleged that in August/September, 2023, one Mr. K.B.Kumar, a garment manufacturer and buying agent approached the complainant and introduced with the



accused Mr. Kunwar Abhilesh Singh, who represented himself as an IAS officer. They induced the complainant for procuring Government tender for supplying school uniforms etc. by using his strong connections with government officials and for the same they demanded Rs. 27 lakh initially and on the said inducement, the complainant made payment of Rs. 1.87 crore through various transactions to the accused Mr. Kunwar Abhilesh Singh, but he failed to procure government tender for the complainant and after much persuasion, he returned Rs. 1 crore on 11.01.2024. It is further alleged that he further induced the complainant and introduced with Mr. K. Shailendra Pratap Singh (applicant), who claimed to be a Minister and Council Secretary of Bodoland Territory "Council, Assam (BTC), who further induced that school uniforms order will be placed later on, but promise for order regarding (1) digital white boards for Govt. Schools in BTS; (2) ESE Lightening Arrestors for Govt. Buildings in BTC; and 3 Thalassemmia tests for BTC council and the said order pertains to several hundred of crores and then they further induced the complainant to make payment, upon which the complainant further transferred Rs. 5.51 crore to Mr. K.Shailendra Pratap Singh by making various bank transactions in the account given by him. The complainant company was induced into making these payments for BTC expenses, registration charges, service charges and procurement of all material from different sources execution of orders and thereafter, the accused K.Shailendra Pratap Singh sent original copies of letter of intent through courier regarding white boards for Govt. Schools in BTS, ESE Lightening Arrestors for Govt. Buildings in BTC and 3 Thalassemmia tests for BTC council. It is further alleged that but even after receiving letter of intent, the complainant did not get any




work order and after chasing many months the aforesaid accused, submission of report and samples to BKC at the behest of the accused K.Shailendra Pratap Singh, their suspicion grew and they met with Mr. Promod Boro Ji, the Hon'ble Chief Executive Member of BTC, who after sending letters of intent, stated that they are fake and in this manner, the aforesaid accused have cheated the complainant to the tune of Rs. 6.18 crore.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 18.12.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the FIR in question essentially emanates from a business/commercial dispute and that the allegations have been twisted so as to lend criminality to the same. Learned counsel has further submitted that, upon culmination of investigation qua the petitioner, the challan has already been presented against the petitioner. Learned counsel has further urged that a settlement/compromise has also been effected between the parties and reduced into writing vide Settlement Deed dated 19.03.2026 (copy whereof has been appended as Annexure P-2 with the instant petition). Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is a man aged about 48 years with no criminal antecedents. 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 19.05.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

4.1 Learned counsel for the complainant has ratified the aspect of




the matter having been settled between the parties and has not opposed the grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case. Before delving into the matter in hand, it would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as ***Gudikanti Narasimhulu and others vs. Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1978 SUPREME COURT 429***, relevant whereof reads as under:

“10. The significance and sweep of Article 21 make the deprivation of liberty a matter of grave concern and permissible only when the law authorising it is reasonable, even-handed and geared to the goals of community good and State necessity spelt out in Article 19. Indeed, the considerations I have set out as criteria are germane to the constitutional proposition I have deduced. Reasonableness postulates intelligent care and predicates that deprivation of freedom- by refusal of bail is not for punitive purpose but for the bi-focal interests of justice-to the individual involved and society affected.

11. We must weigh the contrary factors to answer the test of reasonableness, subject to the need for securing the presence, of the bail applicant. It makes sense to assume that a man on bail has a better chance to prepare or present his case than one remanded in custody. And if public justice is to be promoted, mechanical detention should be close to ours, the function of bail is limited, 'community roots' of the, applicant are stressed and, after the Vera Foundation's Manhattan Bail Project, monetary suretyship is losing ground. The considerable public expense in keeping in custody where no danger of disappearance or disturbance can arise, is not a negligible consideration. Equally important is the deplorable condition, verging on. the inhuman, of our sub-jails, that the unrewarding cruelty and expensive custody of avoidable incarceration makes refusal of bail unreasonable and a Policy favouring release justly sensible.

12. A few other weighty factors deserve reference. All deprivation of liberty is validated by social defence and individual correction along an anti-criminal direction. Public justice is central to the whole scheme of bail law. Fleeing justice must be forbidden but punitive harshness



should be minimised. Restorative devices to redeem the man, even, through community service, meditative drill, study classes or other resources should be innovated, and playing foul with public peace by tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses or committing offence while on judicially sanctioned 'free enterprise,' should be provided against. No seeker of justice shall play confidence tricks on the court or community. Thus, conditions may be hung around bail orders, not to cripple but to protect. Such is the holistic jurisdiction and humanistic orientation invoked by the judicial discretion correlated to the values of our constitution."


5.1. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgment titled as ***Gurcharan Singh vs. State (UT of Delhi) 1978 (1) SCC 118***, has held as under:-

*"Where the granting of bail lies within the discretion of the **court**, the granting or denial is regulated, to a large extent, by the facts and circumstances of each particular case. Since the object of the detention or imprisonment of the accused is to secure his appearance and submission to the jurisdiction and the judgment of the **court**, the primary inquiry is whether a recognizance or bond would effect that end."*

5.2. Furthermore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgment titled as ***Sanjay Chandra vs. CBI (2012) 1 SCC 40***, has held as under:

"21. In bail applications, generally, it has been laid down from the earliest times that the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment, unless it can be required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty.

22. From the earliest times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some un-convicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, "necessity" is the operative test. In this country,




it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances.”

6. The petitioner was arrested on 18.12.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 27.02.2026. Total 31 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. Further, it is not in dispute before this Court that the trial emanating from the FIR in question is a magisterial one. The rival contentions; including the weightage etc. required to be attached to the Settlement Deed (copy whereof has been appended as Annexure P-2 with the present petition); shall be gone into 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 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 19.05.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 05 months and 02 days & is not shown to be involved in any other case.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

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

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.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

21.05.2026
jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No