



122

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

**CRM-M No.57708 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.03.2026**

Paramjeet Singh @ Paramjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar Hooda, Advocate and
Ms. Manya Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. saurabh Arora, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

CRM-10920-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-57708-2025

1. Present fourth petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0010, dated 27.01.2024, under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 472, 474 of IPC (Section 120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Mullanpur Garibdas, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.



2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Gurmail Singh and others. It was alleged that the complainant and many other candidates received a telephonic call from Paramjeet Singh (petitioner), who informed them that the entrance exam for the post of clerk and fireman was scheduled for 17.10.2021. He claimed himself to be the clerk in the Tax Department, Office of the Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, Sector 17 and told that he had connections with higher officials, who oversee the entire selection process. They were assured to get recruited on the payment of Rs.3,00,000/- each. He further told them that in other departments like Postal service, Government of India, the money required to be paid would be Rs.1,50,000/- per candidate. The complainant and others fell in the trap of Paramjeet Singh, i.e. the petitioner and they gave him Rs.3,00,000/- each. Paramjeet Singh and his son, namely, Arshdeep Singh assured them that their appointment letters would be issued soon. They were given two forged letters from Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, however later on they were shocked to learn that they had never been selected for any post. It was alleged that Paramjeet Singh and Arshdeep Singh defrauded the complainant and others by taking lacs of rupees and thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 27.02.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS



Nagar declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 08.08.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court thrice praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M No.26131 of 2024; CRM-M No.58771 of 2024 and CRM-M-14095-2025, however the same were dismissed vide orders dated 03.09.2024, 28.11.2024 and 20.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present fourth petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner is a 4th class employee in Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh. He has submitted that the allegations regarding duping the amount of Rs.55 lacs are false and frivolous and without any basis. He has submitted that there is no evidence against the petitioner of having received any such amount from the complainant. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 02 years and thus his right of speedy trial has been miserably defeated. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that it is the Magisterial trial and there is no material progress in the trial till date. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner along with the other co-accused has duped the



complainant and other victims for an amount of Rs.55 lacs.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that an amount of Rs.55 lacs has been paid in cash to the petitioner, which has been substantiated during the investigation. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been prosecuted in the present FIR and was taken in custody on 27.02.2024. The Magisterial trial is in progress. The allegations against the petitioner of receiving the alleged amount of Rs.55 lacs by way of cash. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 02 years and 24 days as on 28.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be



avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

9. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in ‘**Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024**’, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.
10. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.
11. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
12. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

30.03.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No