

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:032739



CRM-M-73458-2025 (O&M)

Piyush Pandey

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	26.02.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	27.02.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	27.02.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rakesh Chahar, Advocate for the petitioner (through V.C.).
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Aakash Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.
...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the

petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.288, dated 29.10.2025, registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 338, 340 and 61 of the BNS, at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, Faridabad, District Faridabad.

2. As per the allegations, the petitioner had induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs.63.54 lakhs by way of transfer of the same in a bank account, the number of which was disclosed by the petitioner on the premise that he would arrange for getting auctioned a house lying mortgaged with the bank in his favour at a cheaper rate. Petitioner was arrested on 16.12.2025. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The prosecution story is improbable and unnatural. Even otherwise, a compromise has been effected between the parties, which has been reduced into writing. The petitioner has placed on record Annexure P-3, a mutual agreement shown to be executed by the complainant, his father and the petitioner on 26.11.2025. It is further argued that his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant, who is present in Court has raised no serious objection to the contentions of the petitioner's counsel. Rather, he has stated that the complainant has no objection if the petition is allowed.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the fact that he has criminal antecedents, being involved in 02 more cases of similar nature, the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have cheated the complainant of a sum of Rs.63.54 lakhs. He is now stated to have given the money of the complainant back to him. At this stage, no relevance can be given to the compromise, which is claimed to have been arrived at between the parties, the complainant and the petitioner. The allegations as levelled against the petitioner in the FIR *prima facie* make out a case for commission of subject offences against him, however, taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 16.12.2025 and he is not required for further investigation and that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, this Court is of the considered opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody anymore.

8. In view of the discussion as made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner on bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty

Magistrate concerned.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

10. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

27.02.2026

harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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