



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

141

CRM-M-56489-2025
Decided on : 23.02.2026

Vimal Verma . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Randeep Singh Dhakla, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vimal Verma	524	23.12.2024	406, 420 of IPC and 10 &24 of Immigration Act	Ladwa	Kurukshetra

2. As per allegations, complainant was duped of an amount of Rs.66.00 lakhs, out of which Rs.3.70 lakhs are stated to have been credited in the bank account of the petitioner – Vimal Verma.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is inside jail since 16.01.2025, i.e., for a period of about 01 year, 02 months and 06 days. Further submits that the alleged offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, and thus, the petitioner cannot be kept behind bars for an indefinite period. It is also contended that the co-accused, namely, Raj Kamal and Abdul Sabeer @ Irshad Khan, who allegedly received the larger share of the duped amount, have not been arrested till date. Accordingly, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for



bail, submits that the petitioner is directly involved in duping the complainant of a substantial amount and an amount of Rs.3.70 lakhs has been found credited in his bank account, which establishes his active participation in the commission of offence. He further submits that the allegations are serious in nature and involve cheating and illegal immigration activities, which have wider ramifications on society.

However, learned State counsel fairly concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 16.01.2025 and that the offences in question are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. He is also unable to dispute that the other co-accused, who are alleged to have received a larger share of the amount, have not been arrested till date.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

6. Admittedly, petitioner is behind bars since 16.01.2025, i.e., for a period of about 01 year, 02 months and 06 days. The offences alleged against the petitioner are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. It is also not in dispute that out of the total alleged amount, only Rs.3.70 lakhs is stated to have been credited in the account of the petitioner, whereas the role attributed to the other co-accused, who are yet to be arrested, appears to be more significant.

Further, the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Keeping in view the custody period of the petitioner, further incarceration of the petitioner for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose, particularly when the allegations are yet to be proved during trial.

7. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, including the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner; the nature of allegations; the fact that the case is triable by the Court of learned Magistrate; and also without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.
10. Petition stands **disposed of**.
 Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 23, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*