



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

136

CRM-M-73958-2025
Decided on : 18.03.2026

Sumit Ahuja . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sumit Ahuja	110	15.04.2025	406, 420 of IPC, 1860	Ram Nagar	Karnal

2. Complainant – Balwinder Singh, moved a complaint, on the basis of which the FIR in question was registered.

As per the allegations, the complainant wanted to go abroad and, in this regard, he was introduced by his friend to one Sumit Ahuja (petitioner herein) and Tanveer Sandhu, wife of the petitioner. It is alleged that an amount of Rs.12,04,000/- (Rs.4,03,000/- transferred into their accounts and Rs.7,50,000/- paid in cash) was given to them. Besides, a



mobile phone worth Rs.50,000/- was also handed over to the accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that a false case has been planted against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the co-accused, namely Tanveer Sandhu (wife of the petitioner), has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 08.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-18074-2025 titled as "*Tanveer Sandhu v. State of Haryana*".

In support of his contention, learned counsel has produced a copy of the order dated 08.05.2025, which is taken on record.

4. Learned counsel further contends that no such cash amount, as alleged in the complaint/FIR, was ever given to the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is inside the jail since 15.07.2025 and process of recording statements of prosecution witnesses has not yet commenced; therefore, the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. It is further submitted that all the offences alleged are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, learned counsel prays for grant of the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, files status report dated 11.03.2026, in Court, same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been handed over to the opposite counsel.

While vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner, in connivance with the co-accused, has allegedly duped the complainant of a substantial amount of Rs.12,04,000/-.



It is contended that the allegations pertain to a serious economic offence involving breach of trust and cheating.

It is further submitted that in case the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood that he may influence the complainant and other prosecution witnesses or may tamper with the evidence. Therefore, keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve any leniency. However, the other factual assertions made here-above have not been disputed by learned State counsel.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the relevant material available on record.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is noticed that the petitioner has been in custody since 15.07.2025. It is further not disputed that the co-accused, namely Tanveer Sandhu (wife of the petitioner), has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. The offences alleged against the petitioner are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate. It is also a matter of record that the process of recording of prosecution evidence has not yet commenced and, therefore, the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

8. Keeping in view the period of incarceration, the stage of trial, the nature of allegations, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner inside the jail for an indefinite period. Accordingly, this Court deems it a fit case for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

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.

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. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 18, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No