



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(205)

CRM-M-32252-2025(O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: 16.01.2026

Bijender Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.R.S.Rai, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS seeking grant of concession of regular bail, to the petitioner in case FIR no.449 dated 12.11.2024 (Annexure P-1), under Section 420 IPC and Section 25 of Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 (Sections 406, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Tehsil Camp, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 07.04.2025; investigation has been completed and the case is fixed for framing of charge on 19.02.2026; in the initial complaint which is filed by Ishaq Malik, his name is not mentioned but the name of the other co-accused Lovely and Parmanand is specifically mentioned and complainant is not a lehmman person but a businessman being a goldsmith and the period of deposit is also more than one year and learned counsel contended that no offence of cheating is made out as he invested in the scheme and has civil remedy for recovery of his amount; no purpose would



be served by keeping petitioner behind the bars; petitioner was already granted bail on similar cases, therefore, prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the grant of regular bail to the petitioner and submitted that the present petitioner along with co-accused committed a fraud by illegal means deposited the amount to the society and the amount deposited by the depositor was not returned; nine FIRs have also been registered against him regarding these matters but fairly admitted that except the present case he is on bail in other cases.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, as name of present petitioner is not mentioned in complaint by complainant; the present petitioner is in custody since 07.04.2025; the investigation has already been completed; offences are triable by Judicial Magistrate and he was released on bail in another case pertaining to similar facts and similar transactions in the society and trial will take time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability of accused is to be decided after appreciating evidence adduced by both parties and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

16.01.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No