



CRM-M-41695-2024

-1-

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

220(i)

**CRM-M-41695-2024
Date of Decision: 10.09.2025**

SUMAN

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Arun K. Singal, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No. 252 dated 11.06.2024 under Sections 420,406,120-B IPC registered at Police Station City, Gohana, District Sonapat.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner introduced the complainant with co-accused Babli who told her that their company was dealing in the business of almonds and cashews and assured that if money is invested in their company, the same shall be doubled and amount shall be reconciled every six months. Thereafter, the complainant made huge investments which was later embezzled by the accused.



CRM-M-41695-2024

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not committed any offence. He further submits that there is no bank details to substantiate the alleged plea raised by the complainant that any such amount has been invested by the complainant. The petitioner is in custody since 05.08.2024.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the matter has been compromised between the parties and he has no objection if bail is granted to the petitioner.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the above and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and the matter has been comprised between the parties; the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. 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 her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the

**CRM-M-41695-2024****-3-**

satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of her bail.

10.09.2025*renu***(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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