



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

208

CRM-M-44744-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.08.2025

PARMINDER KUMAR @ PAMMI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Ashish Sindher, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), seeking regular bail in FIR No.22 dated 14.02.2020 under Sections 406, 420, 506 IPC registered at Police Station Jhansa, District Kurukshetra.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused has cheated the complainant for an amount of Rs. 52 lakhs on the pretext of arranging the placement of the students of the Skill Development Centre being run by the complainant. It is specifically stated that out of aforesaid amount, an amount of Rs.11,18,200/- was transferred in the account of the accused-petitioner which was withdrawn by him, however, a recovery of only Rs.4,000/- has been effected from the petitioner so far.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 02 years, 03 months and 17 days. He further submits that out of 35 cited prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far.



-2-

4. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone custody of 02 years, 03 months and 17 days and out of 35 cited prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. Keeping in view the above and the fact that the custody undergone by the petitioner is 02 years, 03 months and 17 days; out of 35 cited prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Moreover, the bail is a rule and refusal is the exception. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

22nd August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No