



CRM-M-64780-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-64780-2025
Decided on :16.01.2026

Bajrang

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Dr. Jaiveer Singh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amish Sharma, Asst. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.430 dated 30.07.2024, under Sections 406, 420 IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471 and 201 IPC were added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Bhiwani Haryana.
2. Admittedly, petitioner was employed by the complainant as a Marketing Executive and Traffic Manager in the business run by the complainant-Mr. Vinod Kumar, under the name of Unitrans Packers and Movers.



3. As per the case of the prosecution, cheques in question were admittedly signed by the complainant and were handed over to the petitioner. It is alleged that, through deceit and fraud, an amount of Rs. 1.60 crore was embezzled from the complainant's bank account by presenting the cheques on different occasions. Whether these allegations are substantiated or merely an attempt to settle personal scores with the petitioner is yet to be determined by the trial court.

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that final report has already been submitted after completion of investigation. Out of a total of 18 prosecution witnesses, only four have been examined till date, and petitioner is in custody since 08.04.2025.

5. Further, counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that despite being granted seven opportunities, complainant-Vinod Kumar, has not appeared to depose in the witness box. To support this submission, counsel refers to the zimni orders dated 23.09.2025, 06.10.2025, 20.10.2025, and 03.11.2025 (P-6) and also produced copies of the orders dated 17.11.2025 and 12.01.2026 in court today. Same are taken on record.

In view of the above, petitioner prays for the grant of bail.

6. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail, submitting that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, involving embezzlement of a substantial amount of Rs. 1.60 crore through forged or misused cheques. Petitioner was in a position of trust



and responsibility in the complainant's business, and the accused allegedly abused that trust. Learned State counsel further submits that only few prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, and investigation has revealed sufficient evidence warranting trial. Granting bail at this stage may jeopardize the investigation, interfere with the examination of witnesses, and affect the course of justice. Therefore, prays for dismissal of present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto, including the status report.

7. Considering the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, the fact that the final report has already been submitted, and that only four out of eighteen prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, coupled with the petitioner being in custody since 08.04.2025, it appears that continued detention is not warranted at this stage. It is also noticed that despite multiple opportunities, the complainant has not appeared to depose, which may affect the progress of the trial. Moreover, the alleged offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate. In view of the facts and circumstances, this Court finds merit in the prayer of the petitioner.

Consequently, 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. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.01.2026
Rashmi

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