



CRM-M-70380-2025

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

111

**CRM-M-70380-2025
Decided on : 15.07.2026**

Piyush Pandey

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Rakesh Chahar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sunny Namdev, AAG Haryana

Mr. Sylvester, Advocate for
Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.173, dated 23.10.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 338, 340 and 61 of BNS, registered at Police Station BPTP, Faridabad, District Faridabad.

2. Allegations against the accused, namely Santosh Pandey and Piyush Pandey (father and son respectively), are that they created a forged bank account bearing No.120790200000033 in the name of Asrec India Limited. By misrepresenting themselves and assuring the complainant, Shubham Jain, Director of Shri Energy Developer Private Limited, that they would facilitate the transfer of 80 acres of land owned by Pashupati Fabric Limited, they allegedly succeeded in



CRM-M-70380-2025

receiving the total amount of Rs.3,29,00,000/-.

On 09.09.2025, the said amount was credited into the aforesaid forged bank account, from where, it was further transferred to the bank account of the co-accused namely Santosh Pandey, and other associated accounts.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner is only 19 years old and has already repented the illegal act committed by him. He further submits that an amount of Rs. 3,29,00,000/- with which complainant was defrauded has already been paid back to him, and the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, therefore, by taking a sympathetic view, he may be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel submits that considering the allegation against the petitioner, he does not deserve any concessional relief. Moreover, one another case was registered against him in the State of Haryana (FIR No. 288 dated 29.10.2025 under Section 316(2), 318(4), 338, 340 and 61 of BNS Act, 2023 at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, District Faridabad), in which petitioner was accused and another third case of similar nature in the State of Delhi, wherein petitioner has already been released on bail by Delhi Court. Thus, it is submitted that petitioner appears to be a habitual offender in committing such crimes and if released from jail, he will definitely get involved in some other similar offence.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant endorses the statement of petitioner's counsel, confirming that the defrauded amount of Rs. 3,29,00,000/-has been received back by him, and to that extent there is no grievance. However, looking at the allegations that involving him in such a serious offence, petitioner does not deserve any concessional relief, even though he is currently in his youth.



CRM-M-70380-2025

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

7. Petitioner's father, namely Santosh Pandey, is also accused in the present case, however, he has already been granted the concessional relief of bail by this Court on 17.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-19179-2026. The petitioner is inside the jail since 02.11.2025, i.e. for a period of about 09 months, and the monetary loss, allegedly caused by him has already been reimbursed to the complainant. There are total 19 prosecution witnesses and none has been examined till date. Therefore, further custodial detention of the petitioner is not likely to serve any meaningful purpose.

8. Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, and keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances, nature of allegations, period of incarceration already undergone, and the stage of trial, this Court deems it a fit case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. However, it is made clear that in case petitioner is found indulged in any other offence including of similar nature, the prosecution would immediately move an application before this Court for recalling/cancellation of the present bail order because of misuse of the concessional relief.

Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be

**CRM-M-70380-2025****4**

construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. **Petition stands disposed of.**

Pending Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 15, 2026

reena

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*