

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

134

2026:PHHC:038618



CRM-M-71635-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.03.2026.

SAURAV @ SAURABH YADAV

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Anjali, Advocate, with
Mr. Amit Jangra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, (Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of
regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.372 dated 03.06.2025,
under Section(s) 318(4) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023,
registered at Police Station Sector 10, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2 Status report already filed on behalf of the respondent-State is
taken on record.

3 Briefly summarised, the case as set up by the prosecution is that

one Pooja Yadav i.e. the complainant met the petitioner while in search of a Flat for her friend in the year 2024. The petitioner who was residing in the Signature Global Society made a phone call to the complainant on 03.09.2025 stating that a 2 BHK Flat at Signature Global Proxima, Sector 89, Gurugram was available at an affordable price. It is alleged that eventually it transpired that the petitioner had not booked any flat and embezzled the amount given by the complainant.

4 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 12.06.2025 and has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 09 months. He submits that out of 21 witnesses cited by the prosecution, none has been examined so far, hence, conclusion of trial shall take long. He submits that the petitioner has already suffered sufficient incarceration. He further submits that co-accused Mohd. Shaban @ Salman has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 10.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-58181-2025. He thus submits that the petitioner also deserves the concession of regular bail.

5 State counsel, on the other hand, does not dispute the facts as noticed above i.e. period of actual custody undergone by him and the stage of trial where no witness has been examined so far.

6 Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner which is nearly 09 months in a Magisterial trial as well as the stage of trial where the evidence is yet to commence and that co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 10.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-58181-2025, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail

on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7 It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

March 12, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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