



CRM-M-14290-2025

-1-

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

232

CRM-M-14290-2025

Date of decision : 29.04.2025

Mukesh Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Partap Singh Pathania, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.47 dated 11.10.2024, under Sections 420 & 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Nangal Bhoor, District Pathankot.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the petitioner had accepted a sum of Rs.2,60,000/- from the complainant on the pretext of giving employment to her nephew Gaurav Kumar in Army (T.A.). He, however, submits that there is a delay of three years in lodging the FIR as the money is alleged to have been handed over in March, 2021 while the complaint was given on 30.08.2024. He further submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case while he has no connection with the said offence and there is no transaction in his bank account in this regard. The petitioner is in custody since 31.01.2025 and is not involved in any other case. He, therefore, prays that the petitioner be released on bail.



**CRM-M-14290-2025**

**-2-**

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in Court which indicates that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 months and 27 days as on 28.04.2025. Learned State counsel upon instructions submits that the challan has been presented in Court and charges have been framed against the petitioner.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel(s) and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 months and 27 days; he is not involved in any other case and the trial is likely to take long time, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, I deem it a fit case 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 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.

**29.04.2025**  
A.Kaundal

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

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