



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

206

CRM-M-29148-2025
Date of decision: 29.05.2025

Naveen Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. A. P. Singla, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.57 dated 19.03.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sector-14, District Panchkula.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that complainant had advanced a loan of Rs.90 Lakhs to the petitioner for purchase of machinery. He further submits that M/s J. K. Machine Tools did not deliver the machine. Moreover, it is alleged by the bank officials that the lease was not executed where the factory was to be set up. The petitioner has not been named in the FIR. However, it is alleged against the petitioner that during investigation, Harcharan Singh was arrested on 03.04.2025 and on his disclosure, the name of the petitioner came in the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that certain bills were forged by the petitioner and he got recovered currency notes of an amount of Rs.1,20,000/-. Learned counsel submits that petitioner is in custody for the last 1 month 20 days, and no further recovery has to be got effected from him and the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, the petitioner be released on regular bail.



3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner and submits that petitioner has caused huge loss to the public money to the tune of Rs.90 Lakhs to the public sector bank by playing fraud and cheating by furnishing forged and fabricated documents. He has filed the custody certificate in Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 month and 20 days.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel, and the fact that petitioner is in custody for the last 1 month and 20 days ; trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. 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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

29.05.2025

anil

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