



CRM-M-35547-2025

1

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

216

**CRM-M-35547-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.08.2025**

Vinod Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Chetan Mittal, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Sehej Sandhawalia, Advocate and
Mr. Himanshu Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhra Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana assisted by
ASI Neeraj.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner is praying for regular bail in case FIR No.111 dated 04.03.2018 registered under Sections 406, 420, 204 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, 'IPC') and Section 3 of Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in the Financial Establishment Act, 2013 at Police Station Sector 31, District Faridabad.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Gopal Sharma with the allegations that he knew one Vinod Garg (petitioner), who told him that Anil Jindal (Chairman, SRS Group), is his nephew and he is carving out plots & constructing flats and he can invest some amount and the prices will increase manifold and during this period, he will get an interest of 1.5 per cent per month on his investment. On his



allurement, he invested Rs.5 lakhs in the year 2015 and lateron, he came to know that the accused have taken crores of rupees from thousands of people and have cheated them. To repay the amount, he was given a cheque of Rs. 6.5 lakhs on behalf of M/s SRS Build Mart Private Limited which was signed by one of their security guard Davinder Adhana, who was shown as a full time Director under his signature but the cheque got dishonoured and he has been cheated.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He was a Director in SRS Limited and had also resigned from the said company on 06.02.2017. He has never been a Director of SRS Real Infrastructure Limited and M/s Swami Hightech Projects Limited and he cannot be arrayed as an accused merely because he happened to be the Director of one of the sister company upto February 2017. He was also not named in the FIR. Numerous FIR's have been registered against him and he has already been released on bail by Co-ordinate Benches of this Court, details of which are as under:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Case No.	Decision
1.	238	13.04.2018	CRM-M-64472-2024	Allowed
2.	542	11.09.2018	CRM-M-15280-2021	Allowed
3.	43	23.01.2020	CRM-M-15228-2021	Allowed
4.	117	04.03.2018	CRM-M-15273-2021	Allowed
5.	213	06.04.2018	CRM-M-53948-2021	Allowed
6.	214	06.04.2018	CRM-M-53873-2021	Allowed
7.	215	06.04.2018	CRM-M-52083-2021	Allowed
8.	216	06.04.2018	CRM-M-17796-2021	Allowed
9.	231	11.04.2019	CRM-M-52057-2021	Allowed
10.	260	21.04.2021	CRM-M-15318-2021	Allowed
11	542	11.09.2018	CRM-M-15280-2021	Allowed
12	43	23.01.2020	CRM-M-15228-2021	Allowed
13	273	26.04.2018	CRM-M-63965-2024	Allowed



14	489	10.08.2018	CRM-M-5178-2025	Allowed
15	217	06.04.2018	CRM-M-63962-2024	Allowed
16	121	06.04.2018	CRM-M-2345-2025	Withdrawn
17	200	17.05.2019	CRM-M-2263-2025	Withdrawn
18	123	04.03.2018	CRM-M-2261-2025	Withdrawn
19	153	09.05.2021	CRM-M-4706-2025	Withdrawn
20	206	05.04.2018	CRM-M-5930-2025	Withdrawn
21	114	04.03.2018	CRM-M-2264-2025	Withdrawn
22	111	04.03.2018	CRM-M-4005-2025	Withdrawn
23	51	17.02.2019	CRM-M-3952-2025	Withdrawn
24	205	05.04.2018	CRM-M-2337-2025	Allowed

4. Learned counsel further contended that trial will take sufficiently long time to conclude and his further detention is not required and the petitioner may be released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel & perused the paper-book. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 31.01.2025. All the main accused who have been named in the FIR have already been released on regular bail. The entire case is based on documentary evidence, which has already been collected and are a part of the final report which has already been presented before the trial Court. As to whether petitioner could be impleaded as an accused without being Director or in any way responsible for the day to day affairs and conduct of the business of the company shall also be a moot question during the trial. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything upon the merits of the case, the petition is allowed & petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate



CRM-M-35547-2025

4

concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

11.08.2025

Rajeev (rvs)

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No