



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

266

CRM-M-30549 of 2025
Date of decision: 29.07.2025

Prem Rajan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Arman Goyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.0029 dated 18.05.2024, under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC (Section 201 IPC added later on) registered at P.S. Cyber Sonipat, District Sonipat, Haryana

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with his co-accused have duped the complainant by alluring her to invest a huge amount of Rs. 81 Lakhs in some companies which were stated to be registered with SEBI, however, they were found to be fake companies.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as no amount has been received by him in his account. It is stated that complainant has now been examined as PW-1 in which she has exonerated the petitioner from the charges as imposed against him as she had never met with the petitioner. He further submits that *challan* has been presented and charges have been



framed. The petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 01 month and 28 days as under trial, therefore, petitioner be released on bail pending trial.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the reply by way of an affidavit of Vipin Kumar Ahlawat, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Rai, Sonipat on behalf of the respondent-State as well as custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which are taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 01 month and 28 days.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that the *challan* has been presented and charges have been framed; 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.

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



9. 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

29.07.2025

anil

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