



CRM-M-136-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

216

**CRM-M-136-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 30.04.2026**

PARDEEP BISLA**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rahul Sidher, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.300 dated 01.09.2025, under Sections 318(4), 316(2) of The Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered at Police Station Urban Estate Hisar, District Hisar.

2. The present case has been registered on a complaint made by the complainant namely Satish Kumar wherein it is alleged that the petitioner was posted as Sales Manager in a Company dealing with selling of used cars and it is alleged that the petitioner had committed cheating of an amount of Rs.33,63,000/- from March 2025 till July 2025 by not depositing the amount deposited by the customers in the account of complainant. Later on 13.07.2025, the petitioner left the job of the complainant-Company without any intimation and after the complainant came to know of the alleged fraud committed by the petitioner after the petitioner left the said job.



CRM-M-136-2026 (O&M) -2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 14.10.2025; investigation has been completed & charges have been framed; out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far; offences in the present case is triable by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, wherein maximum punishment under the relevant provisions, is upto 07 years; the present FIR was registered after the petitioner left the job of the complainant-Company; the petitioner left the job on 13.07.2025 and the FIR was lodged on 01.09.2025 i.e., after a period of one and a half month; trial will take sufficient time to conclude, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period; as such, prayed for concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Yashdeep Nain, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant by way of filing of *Vakalatnama* and opposed the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner while submitting that the present petitioner has cheated the complainant with hefty amount; complainant has been dealing in used cars and the petitioner after receiving part amount/ payments in cash from the customers, did not deposit the same with the complainant.

6. Mr. Satbir Singh Goripuria, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and by way of filing of status report by way of affidavit of Sunil Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hisar dated 29.04.2026 & custody certificate



CRM-M-136-2026 (O&M) -3-

dated 29.04.2026, opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner while submitting that the present petitioner cheated the complainant by not depositing entire sale proceeds in the Company's account.

However, regarding the mode & manner of alleged fraud committed by the petitioner, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant were unable to satisfy the Court. In particular, no material has been placed on record such as, forged payment receipts or report of the Chartered Accountant of the Company to substantiate how it was concluded that a fraud of an amount of Rs.33,63,000/-had been committed by the petitioner. On a query posed by this Court, learned counsel for the State & Complainant failed to give plausible explanation regarding modus operandi of the petitioner.

7. Heard.

8. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the present case, the rival contentions of the parties & without commenting upon the merits of the present case, this Court finds merit in the present petition on the following aspects:

- (I) investigation has been completed & challan has been filed;
- (II) the petitioner has been in custody for the last 06 months & 10 day;
- (III) FIR was lodged after the petitioner left the job nearly after a period of one & a half month;



CRM-M-136-2026 (O&M) -4-

(IV) the trial is at the stage of prosecution evidence whereby out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 02 have been examined so far;

(V) trial is likely to take sufficient time to conclude, as such, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping her in custody for any further period

9. Concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

10. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

11. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

30.04.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO