

2025:PHHC:099543



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

262

**CRM-M No.38777 of 2025
Date of Decision: 04.08.2025**

Darshan Dua @ Darshan Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Lalit Kumar Narang, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0307	22.05.2024	Shivaji Colony, District Rohtak	420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Pradeep alleging that the petitioner and co-accused Dharambir had induced him to part with a sum of Rs.10,61,499/- on the pretext of securing a job in IRCTC Railway Department. He was given a forged letter of appointment through

2025:PHHC:099543



Whatsapp and when the complainant demanded his money back, he was extended threats.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested and is in custody since 23.09.2024. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. No recovery remains to be effected from him. He had never issued any appointment letter in favour of the complainant or any other person. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, it is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He is a habitual offender being involved in some other cases of similar nature. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs.10,61,499/- on the pretext of getting him employed in Railway Department. As per the allegations, a false appointment letter was prepared by the petitioner and the co-accused

2025:PHHC:099543



and was given to the complainant. The petitioner is now in custody since 23.09.2024. The investigation stands completed. The trial will, however, take time to conclude. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. The petitioner cannot be denied benefit of bail because of his involvement in other cases. He is on bail in two of such cases. Keeping in view the afore discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest they prejudice the case of the prosecution, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail during the pendency of the trial subject to his furnishing personal bonds as well as surety bonds by two sureties to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. He shall deposit his passport, if any, with the learned trial Court.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

04.08.2025
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No