

CRM-M-66735-2025

2026:PHHC:004361



238

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

CRM-M-66735-2025

Parminder Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

Date of decision: January 15, 2026

Date of Uploading: January 15, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Harpreet S. Multani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

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.401 dated 19.05.2023, for the offence punishable under Sections 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 409, 477-A & 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The gravamen of allegations against the petitioner is that the complainant, namely, Pawan Narula, Executive Engineer (OP) Division, UHBVN, Yamuna Nagar, alleged that M/s S.B. Roadline, an authorized contractor of the Nigam for execution of electrical works under the Division, submitted forged and fabricated bills to the Nigam. Upon verification of

CRM-M-66735-2025

records pertaining to the years 2021–22 and 2022–23 maintained at the Division Office and Sub-Division Office, it was revealed that the firm had fraudulently obtained payments amounting to approximately ₹2,01,28,255/- against such false bills, allegedly in connivance with certain employees of the Nigam.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 06.10.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further argued that FIR in question pertains to the incident of year 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, for which investigation already stands completed and challan has also been presented *qua* the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the police has erred in looking into documentary aspect of the matter and has wrongly put up the challan. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has carried out work in question in accordance with rules and regulations. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is a man aged 38 years with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 14.01.2026 and status report by way of an affidavit dated 09.01.2026, in the Court today, which are taken on record. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/ serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail.

CRM-M-66735-2025

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 06.10.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and the challan *qua* the petitioner has been presented on 02.01.2026. Total 32 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which, none has been examined till date. It is thus, indubitable, that conclusion of the trial will take long time. The rival contention raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon 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 14.01.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 03 months and 06 days, & is not shown to be involved in any other FIR(s).

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:

CRM-M-66735-2025

- (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/Illaqa 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

January 15, 2026
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No