



CRM-M-67776-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

120

CRM-M-67776-2025
Decided on : 09.04.2026

Bahadur Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Vini Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G. Haryana

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Jangra, Advocate
for the complainant

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
Bahadur Singh, aged 46 years	0084	19.04.2025	406, 420 and 506 of IPC	Sector 17/18	Gurugram

2. Case of the prosecution has been detailed in para No. 2 of the impugned order and same reads as under:

“Brief facts of the prosecution case are to the effect that a complaint was given



by complainant Khem Chand against the applicant /accused wherein he stated that he came in contact with the applicant/accused through his friend Virender. Virender told him that the applicant/ accused is working as a tout who can procure employment to fourth class posts in District Courts Narnaul. Complainant fell into the trap for securing bright future for his married daughter and he sought a job for his son in law. In this respect he met applicant/accused in Sector 18 Market where applicant/accused projected himself to be a relative of former Hon'ble Chief Justice of India and took the guarantee for securing employment for the son-in-law of the complainant. Thereafter, the applicant/accused got the form of the son-in-law of the complainant filled up for the post of Peon in Narnaul Court and interview for the said post was fixed on 27.2.2016. Applicant/accused called the complainant in Sector 18 market Gurugram and made him sit in his Fortuner car and took a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- for getting the work done. Thereafter, on 1.3.2016 applicant/accused again called the complainant and asked for a further sum of Rs.10,00,000/- stating that a farm house has to be got purchased by him for the wife of former Hon'ble Chief Justice of India and on this pretext he borrowed a further sum of Rs.10,00,000/- stating that he would procure a second job for the complainant or would return the second installment of Rs.10,00,000/- with interest. After few days when the result for the post of peon was declared, son in law of the complainant could not succeed in getting the employment upon which applicant/accused assured that he would get the employment secured in the next batch of recruitment. Since then, the applicant/accused kept delaying the matter on one pretext or the other despite repeated requests of the complainant and demand for returning the money. Complaint was given in the police station and in the police station applicant/accused gave an undertaking to return the money in presence of witnesses in the temple. Complainant further stated that various persons named by him in his complaint are the witnesses to his case and stated that previous criminal history is also attached with the accused.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that by concocting the version, complainant got involved him as accused in the present case and rather now he himself is facing proceedings for paying 'cash for job' for his son in law as he has also been made accused in the present case. He further submits that petitioner was arrested on 25.07.2025 and investigation thereafter was completed



CRM-M-67776-2025

and even challan was submitted on 12.09.2025. Recording of process of the statements of witnesses is likely to consume considerable time, because the application filed by the complainant, who actually is now accused also, for his discharge, is pending consideration before the Court of concerned Area Magistrate. He further submits that all the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and already petitioner has suffered incarceration for a more than a period of 08 months and merely for the reason that the alleged amount was demanded to disrepute the highest post in the institution, should not come in the way of considering the plea of bail. In the background of the circumstances as argued by learned senior counsel for the petitioner before this Court, thus, prays for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made in the petition and submit that petitioner is involved in a serious offence as much as he has tried to disrepute the name of former Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India and, thus, has tried to abuse the reputation addressed to constitutional post. However, there is no denial that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date, rather charges are yet to be framed. It is also admitted position that petitioner is already inside jail in the present case for the last more than a period of 08 months.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and examined the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

6. Considering all the factual aspects, which have been taken by the petitioner and most of them recorded here above also and that at this stage no definite opinion can be framed nor it is warranted in the proceedings of the present

petition because same is the issue pending before the trial Court, I do not find any



CRM-M-67776-2025

substantial reason to reject the plea of bail.

7. 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. However, before parting with the order it is hereby made clear that in case, in future, petitioner is found involved directly in such like cases disreputing the public offices, immediately application for cancellation of bail because of misusing of the concession granted by this Court will be instituted by the State itself, without any delay.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. 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.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

April 09, 2026

reena

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE