



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M No.12730 of 2025
DATE OF DECISION : 9th JULY, 2025

Sushil Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

* * * *

Present : Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

* * * *

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.48 dated 26.03.2018, under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, Police Station Machhiwara, District Ludhiana.
2. On 22.04.2025 after recording contention of the petitioner and complainant, following order was passed by this court:

“Learned counsel for the complainant submits that as per the allegations, the complainant was cheated upon with an amount of Rs. 7 lakh for sending him abroad. After registration of the FIR dispute was compromised between the co-accused Jatinder Singh and the complainant and thereupon compromise quashing petition i.e. CRM-M-32054-2018 filed by Jatinder Singh, has been allowed by quashing the FIR proceedings qua him only. Counsel points out that he is also ready to settle the dispute, if, the prayer made herein is allowed by the Court.

Complainant is also being represented before this Court and complainant Gurleen Kaur submits that she is ready to settle the dispute as expressed by the petitioner.



Considering the plea and the reason that the proceedings qua the co-accused Jatinder Singh have already been quashed partially, petitioner is directed to be released on ad interim regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

List again on 09.07.2025.”

3 Today none has appeared for the complainant, however, the petitioner expressed inclination to be abide by the statement, which he got recorded before this court on the previous date of hearing i.e. 22.04.2025.

4. In view of the factum of compromise, as recorded in the previous order, this court deems it appropriate to make the order of interim regular bail dated 22.04.2025, absolute.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to the bail/surety bonds already furnished by the petitioner, if not required in any other case.

6. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereinabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.



7. It is further made clear that if in future petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancelation of bail in the present case.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

9th July, 2025
'raj'

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>