



CRM-M-35301-2025

1

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

214

**CRM-M-35301-2025 (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.51 dated 17.02.2019 registered under Sections 406, 420 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 Shantanu Rana with the allegations that he was approached by accused No.1-M/s SRS Real Infrastructure Limited and its Directors i.e accused Nos.2 to 6 to invest Rs.37.40 lakhs in the SRS Tower Project situated at Faridabad and promised to return the money with interest. On their assurance, he had invested Rs.26.40 lakhs which were paid through cheques and he was allotted one unit in the SRS Tower vide allotment letter dated 10.08.2011. Since he was not getting any profit from the project, he



approached the accused company after 10.08.2014 to return his amount on surrender of the unit in terms of the allotment letter but the money was not returned. The company returned about Rs.7,40,000/- in 2015 and accept the balance amount. Thereafter, they offered to invest his amount in another project namely SRS Emerald Court and he was allotted another unit and he was granted assured return of 12 per cent per annum. Accused No.1-company also introduced him to accused No.7-company along with its Directors i.e. accused No.8 to 15 and a lease deed was executed in his favour and rent agreement with accused No.7-company. Infact, both the companies, namely, SRS Real Infrastructure Limited and M/s Swami Hightech Projects Limited and its directors were working hand in gloves with each other to cheat innocent investors. However, accused No.7-company started paying him Rs.27,000/- per month after deducting TDS of Rs.3000/- per month and thereafter stopped making payments since 02.03.2017. Thereafter, no money was paid and the amount invested by him was also not returned and he has been cheated. Accused-petitioner was arrested on 11.04.2025 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented against the accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated. 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 Director of one of the sister companies upto the year 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	U/S	Name of Police Station
1.	Court complaint No.2702/2018	N/A	Not shown PW not available	Police Station Greater Kailash, South Delhi
2.	Court complaint No.2701/2018	N/A	Not shown PW not available	Police Station Greater Kailash, South Delhi
3.	217/2018	N/A	120-B, 406, 420 IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
4.	Court complaint No.COMA 26/2018	N/A	74(3) of Companies Act, 2013	Police Station Not applicable, Gurugram
5.	238/2018	13/04/2018	406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 204, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
6.	273/2018	26/04/2018	406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
7.	205/2018	05/04/18	406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
8.	489/2018	10/08/18	406, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
9.	153/2021	09/05/21	406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
10.	121/2018	04/03/18	406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
11.	200/2019	17/05/2019	406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
12.	51/2019	17/02/2019	406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
13.	123/2018	04/03/18	120-B,204, 406, 420, 506 of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
14.	114/2018	04/03/18	120-B,406, 420, of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
15.	213/2018	N/A	120-B,204, 406, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
16.	214/2018	N/A	120-B,204, 406 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
17.	117/2018	N/A	120-B, 406, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad



18	216/2018	N/A	120-B,204, 406, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
19	231/2018	N/A	204, 406, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
20	43/2020	N/A	120-B, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
21	542/2018	N/A	120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
22	260/2018	N/A	120-B, 406, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
23	215/2018	N/A	120-B,204, 406, 420 of IPC	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
24	122/2018	04/03/18	420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 204, 120-B of IPC, 3 of HR.F E Act	Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad
25	542/2019	26/11/2019	120-B, 420, 468, 471 of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station Not applicable, Faridabad
26	206/2018	05/04/18	120-B,204, 406, 420 of IPC, 3 of HPID Act	Police Station not applicable, Faridabad

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 have 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

**CRM-M-35301-2025****5**

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 concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

11.08.2025

Rajeev (rvs)

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No