

CRM-M-607-2025

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

CRM-M-607-2025
Reserved on: 06.03.2025
Pronounced on: 19.03.2025

Sandeep Singla @ Sandeep Kumar Singla ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. G.S. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
06	19.10.2016	State Crime, District SAS Nagar (Mohali)	406, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B IPC and Sections 4 & 5 of Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1978

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC, seeking regular bail.

2. Per paragraph 35 of the bail application, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1.	50	23.05.2016	406, 420 & 120-B of IPC and Sections 4 & 5 of Prize Chits and Money Circulation Scheme Banning Act, 1978	Singh Bhagwantpura, Ropar, District Fatehabad
2.	42	26.01.2017	406, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of IPC and Sections 4, 5 & 6 of Prize Chits and Money Circulation Scheme Banning Act, 1978	City Tohana, District Fatehabad

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“3. That it is submitted that the present matter pertains to case FIR No. 06 dated 19.10.2016 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC and sections 4 and 5 of the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Scheme (Banning) Act, 1978, registered at

Police Station State Crime, SAS Nagar, Mohali on the complaint of Harjinder Singh Dhillon son of Surjit Singh against Jagjit Singh, MD, Crown Credit Cooperative Society and others.

4. That the present matter arises out of 470 different complaints received in Bureau of Investigation, Punjab. In the said complaints allegations of cheating, forgery and misappropriation of money were levelled against the various persons alleged to be managing the affairs of Crown Credit Cooperative Society; Bombay Investment Group; Future Choice Group; Live Trading India Company' Mega Fine Agro Concept Limited; Nicer Green Housing, 4S Forever and Trade Next Limited. The complainants had alleged that Jagjit Singh, Managing Director of Crown Credit Cooperative Society had collected huge amount of money from various innocent people and misappropriated the same through Hawala transactions and Money Laundering activities.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family. He further submits that petitioner is entitled to bail on the ground of parity with co-accused Krishan Kumar who has been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.12.2022 passed in CRM-M No.22160 of 2022 and prolonged incarceration.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“A. Role of the Petitioner

11. That during the course of the investigation total 66 accused persons were nominated in the case and the petitioner Sandeep Singla alias Sandeep Kumar Singla was nominated as accused in present case FIR No. 06 dated 19.10.2016, PS State Crime, Punjab, SAS Nagar on 19.01.2018 on the statement of Maninder Singh son of Inderjit Singh, resident of House No. 140 Civil line Patiala, who stated that the petitioner Sandeep Kumar Singla had been working in close association with the main accused of the case Jagjit Singh and some other persons under the Crown Credit Company and have cheated the innocent people by misappropriating their hard earned money.

During the course of investigation and custodial interrogation of the petitioner Sandeep Kumar Singla, it was found that petitioner Sandeep Kumar Singla was working as an agent for the main accused in the case namely Jagjit Singh, MD Crown Credit Co-Operative Society limited and collected money from innocent people on the pretext of giving them twice the amount in return within a period of three year and made investments in the Crown Credit Company. During his examination, the petitioner Sandeep Kumar Singla disclosed that he had collected an amount

of about 4-5 crore rupees from the general public and received commission for the same from Jagjit Singh in cash.”

7. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing.

8. Per paragraph 33 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 21.04.2022.

9. Given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, petitioner is entitled for bail on parity and period of custody and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

11. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

12. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

13. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

14. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

15. This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State shall file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.

CRM-M-607-2025

16. The concerned Judicial Magistrate/ Trial Court is authorized to delete, modify, or relax any of the conditions mentioned above and is competent to do so following the law.

17. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

18. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

19. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

19.03.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.