



CRM-M-492 of 2026

-1-

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

240

CRM-M-492 of 2026
Date of Decision: 19.02.2026

Sonu alias Soni

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.67 dated 16.04.2025 registered under Sections 61(2), 351(2), 351(3), 318(4), 316(2), 249, 336(3), 338 and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Sections 4, 5 and 6 of PCMC Act, Section 3(2) of HPIDFE Act, 2013 and Section 21(2) of BUDS Act, 2019, at Police Station Sadar Ratia, District Fatehabad.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused under the name of 'Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Service Private Limited' duped the complainant for a sum of Rs.3 lakhs on the pretext of multiplying his money. When the complainant asked to return his money, he was given threats. Hence, the

**CRM-M-492 of 2026****-2-**

present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor has any concern with the said offence. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by one co-accused Raj Kumar @ Raj Singla. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. He argued that the petitioner was mere an employee of the company namely 'Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Service Private Limited' and was working as commission agent. He argued that it was the main accused Dr. Sukhdev Singh, who was running the said company and induced the investors to invest their money and misappropriated the amount. He argued that no amount has been siphoned off by the petitioner and the entire amount collected by him has been deposited with the company and he only received the salary/commission in lieu of those investments. Further, co-accused Jitender Kumar, Manjeet Singh, Raj Kumar alias Raj Singla and Sukhdev Singh have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Co-ordinate Benches of this Court, vide orders dated 11.08.2025, 30.09.2025 04.12.2025 and 11.02.2026, respectively. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from him. The petitioner is in custody since 14.10.2025. The investigation in this case is complete, challan stands presented but charges

**CRM-M-492 of 2026****-3-**

are yet to be framed and there are 145 prosecution witnesses cited by the prosecution and their examination will take long time. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and status report in the matter, which are taken on record and while referring to the status report, he has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 04 months; he has clean antecedents; co-accused have been granted bail by the co-ordinate Benches of this Court; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges are yet to be framed; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial and the same will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131,***

**CRM-M-492 of 2026****-4-**

wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

19.02.2026
D.Bansal

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