

2025:PHHC:084305



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

**CRM M-23340-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:11.07.2025**

Shailender Kumar ...Petitioner  
Versus  
State of Haryana ... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT**

Present : Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, haryana.

**N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J.**

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant a regular bail in case FIR No.30 dated 30.01.2023 registered under Sections 406, 409, 420 and 120-B of IPC and Section 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act at Police Station Madlauda, District Panipat.

2. While granting the concession of *interim* bail to petitioner on 06.05.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions on behalf of the petitioner:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case by the police. In fact the allegations pertained to embezzlement of an amount of Rs.21,60,941/-, however, the petitioner has already deposited the said amount*

*with the Department of Panchayat vide the receipt Annexure P-1. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 04.12.2024 and challan has already been presented against him. He further contends that the petitioner is an ex Sarpanch and is having deep roots in the society. Thus, there are no chances of fleeing from the process of justice. He further contends that only the petitioner has been made scapegoat and the other officials, who were accused in the present case, have not been arrested by the police so far.”*

3. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the averments made above and submits that the petitioner is on *interim* bail. However, after the grant of *interim* bail, he has not misused the concession of bail in any manner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

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

6. The petitioner was ordered to be released on *interim* bail on 06.05.2025 and, thereafter, he has not misused the said concession in any manner. Even, the amount of alleged embezzlement has already deposited with the Department of Panchayat vide receipt (Annexure P-1). Thus, the custody of the petitioner will not serve any

purpose and the *interim* order dated 06.05.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall remain on bail, during the course of trial on the bail bonds/surety bonds which have already been submitted by him before the concerned Court.

11.07.2025

amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

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