



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

CRM-M No.37641 of 2026(O&M)

Date of decision: 17.07.2026

Randhir Singh Rathore

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present :- Ms. Pooja Jaglan Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

H.S.GREWAL, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 07 dated 18.01.2026, registered under Sections 61(2), 316(5) and 318(4) BNS (409, 420 and 120-B IPC) at Police Station Cyber Crime, Panipat.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant, Jitender Singh Kadian, proprietor of Agritech Biotechnology India Limited, was induced by the accused, who introduced himself as the Managing Director of Hifan Chemicals and Fertilizers Private Limited, to obtain a franchise for the supply of DAP, urea, and NPK fertilizers. Upon which, the complainant transferred Rs. 2 lacs as advance, besides giving two blank

cheques as security. However, despite repeated assurances, neither the franchise nor the promised supplies were provided. Subsequently, on 13.01.2026, an amount of Rs.35 lacs was allegedly withdrawn from the complainant's bank account. Upon attempting to contact the accused, the complainant found all his phone numbers switched off, leading to the registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the petitioner had promised to provide a franchise to the complainant, out of the alleged amount of Rs.35 lacs, a sum of Rs.17,18,000/- has already been recovered during the course of investigation and Rs.10 lacs has been released to the complainant, while the remaining Rs.7,18,000/- continues to remain frozen in the bank account. It is also submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 4 months and 28 days and is not involved in any other criminal case. Accordingly, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 04 months and 28 days.

6. Mr. Prateek Rathee, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of

the complainant and has filed his *Vakalatnama*, which is taken on record.

He also opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 04 months and 28 days and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

8. 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 learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. All the pending application(s) also stands disposed of accordingly.

17.07.2026
seema

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No