

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

CRM-M-22443-2026

Date of decision: 12.05.2026

GYANENDRA SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Ms. Seema Thapliyal, Advocate
(through video conferencing) and
Mr. Shailender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Mr. Vishal Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anand Bishnoi, Advocate for the complainant.
(poa/moa not filed)

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.12 dated 10.01.2026 registered under Sections 308(2) and 318(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad.


2. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are that he dishonestly conducted dealership business with complainant company, and later tried to pressurize the company to withdraw legal proceedings by making false complaints, protests, and defamatory social media campaigns. The petitioner also extended threats to the officers of the complainant's company to implicate them in false cases along with protest outside its premises.



Petitioner defamed complainant's company and levelled allegations of cheating, fraud, forgery and corruption against its management. The petitioner also extended threats for causing harm to other employees and demanded an amount of Rs.60 lakhs or 6 tractors by way of extortion.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the following grounds :

- i. The petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as present FIR has been lodged on false and frivolous grounds.
- ii. Petitioner is previous dealer of the complainant company, there was some dispute between them, for which, a settlement agreement was also made.
- iii. Petitioner is in custody since 31.01.2026 i.e. for the last 03 months and 11 days.
- iv. Investigation has already been completed and final report under Section 193 of BNSS has already been filed.
- v. Petitioner is not required for any investigation purpose and has already been remanded to judicial custody.
- vi. Petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal activity.
- vii. Trial will take sufficient time to conclude. No fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period.



4. Learned State counsel has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He opposed the prayer of the petitioner on the grounds that

- i. An audio clip of the petitioner is available on record, whereby, the petitioner has made a demand of an amount of Rs.60 lakhs or 06 tractors from the complainant company.
- ii. The cheque, which was given by the petitioner, in order to discharge his legal liability, was also dishonoured.


6. In rebuttal, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the cheque was given to the complainant company for security purpose only as the petitioner was the dealer of the complainant company, which was later misused by the complainant company.

7. Learned counsel for the complainant company vehemently opposed the prayer made by the petitioner and submitted that a settlement was effected between the parties, as per which, the complainant company paid an amount of Rs.15 lakhs to the petitioner, however, despite the settlement, the petitioner is threatening the complainant to post some defamatory post on social media and demanded an amount of Rs.60 lakhs.

8. Heard.

9. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the following contentions of learned counsel for the parties that :

- i. Petitioner is in custody since 31.01.2026 i.e. for the last more than 03 months.



- ii. Investigation has already been completed and final report under Section 193 of BNSS has already been filed, therefore, petitioner is not required for any investigation purpose.
- iii. Petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal activity.
- iv. Trial will take sufficient time to conclude. No fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any further period.

8. Concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability of accused is to be decided after appreciating evidence adduced by both the parties. It is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

May 12, 2026
Manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- (i) Whether speaking/reasoned
- (ii) Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No