



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

203+205

CRM-M-340-2026(O&M)
CRM-M-5374-2026(O&M)
Date of decision: 09.03.2026

1. CRM-M-340-2026(O&M)

Harsh Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-5374-2026(O&M)

Chandra Vardhan Jain

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Prashant Singh Chauhan and Mr. Rahul Sangwan, Advocates
for Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-340-2026.

Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawaliala, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-5374-2026.

Mr. Onkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sidhartha Barua, Advocate (through V.C.) with
Mr. Arora Vishwas Kumar, Advocate,
for the complainant in both the petitions.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-4069-2026 IN CRM-M-5374-2026

Allowed, as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

Both these petitions have been filed by two different accused arising out of the same case bearing FIR No.305 dated 20.12.2024 registered under Sections 120-B, 408, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Udyog Vihar, District Gurugram and are hence being decided by a common order.



2. For the facility of reference, facts are however extracted from CRM-M-5374-2026 titled as '**Chandra Vardhan Jain Vs. State of Haryana**'.

3. Briefly summarized the facts of the present case are as follows:

“The prosecution case is that Hitachi Astemo Gurugram Powertrain Systems Pvt. Ltd. was defrauded to the tune of about Rs.12.767 crores through a well-hatched conspiracy by its two employees, Rohit Naithani (Executive, Accounts) and Vineet Jha (Senior Executive, Purchase), in connivance with several sham vendors. It is alleged that the said employees, being conversant with the procurement and payment systems of the company, fabricated purchase requests, purchase orders, clearance forms and forged signatures of approving authorities, and planted fake invoices into the SAP system by misusing the journal voucher booking method, which is ordinarily not meant for procurement. In this manner, funds were released to vendors such as Burgeon International, JMD Enterprises, Koncept Enterprises, Shivalik International, Shree Traders, Unique Impex, Shiva International, Virgo International, Swastik International and YVON Technologies Pvt. Ltd., even though no goods or services were ever supplied. The forensic investigation conducted by Nangia Anderson LLP revealed 376 fake invoices and 51 forged POS between January 2023 and March 2024, supported by editable invoice templates, blank quotations, and other forged material recovered from the laptops of the accused employees. The vendors were found to be non-existent at their stated addresses, many of them sharing common phone numbers and GST irregularities, which pointed to their collusion in the fraud. Kickbacks were allegedly routed back to the employees by these vendors. When suspicion arose, the accused employees are stated to have destroyed evidence by deleting files and records from their systems. The systematic manipulation of the procurement and payment system caused wrongful loss to the complainant company and corresponding wrongful gain to the accused.”



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners contend that the petitioners have been nominated as accused solely with the aid of Section 120-B IPC. It is contended that the petitioners were not employees of the firm and despite the concluded investigation against the petitioners, there is no charge of petitioners having forged any specific document to facilitate transfer of money. It is alleged that as per the case, certain amounts were transferred to the accounts of the petitioners by the main accused-Rohit Naithani and Vineet Jha. It is further contended that in the said circumstances, the commission of offence under Section 408 of IPC and/or relating to forgery would not be made out against the petitioners. They further contend that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents and that they are in custody since 10.09.2025 (petitioner in CRM-M-340-2026) and 18.10.2025 (in CRM-M-5374-2026) respectively. The chargesheet has been filed and the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate. The petitioners have thus undergone an actual custody of more than 05 months. There are total 29 witnesses cited by the prosecution out of which none has been examined so far and as such the trial shall take long time in its conclusion.

4. Learned State Counsel as well as the counsel for the complainant does not dispute the facts noticed above, however, they vehemently contend that the petitioners had received the amount in their account and they actively colluded with the other accused in submitting the forged invoices and thereby receiving the amount in their accounts. However, it is not disputed that it is a magisterial trial and that recording of evidence is yet to commence or that one of the co-accused i.e. Vineet Jha has already been granted concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 29.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-52226-2025.



5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended along with the present petition.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners, their clean criminal antecedents as well as the fact that the investigation does not reflect that the petitioners had forged the documents and they are nominated as accused with the aid of Section 120-B IPC and noticing that it is a magisterial trial in which the petitioners have already undergone an actual custody of more than 05 months, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

7. The instant petitions are *allowed* and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

09.03.2026

Sumit Gusain

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE