

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

Sr.No.218

CRM-M No.21956 of 2022

Date of Decision: 12th September, 2022

Sarfraj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr.Mazlish Khan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of regular bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.180 dated 29.06.2021 registered at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal, under Sections 420 & 406 IPC (wherein the offences under Sections 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Sections 66-C & 66-D of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 are stated to have been added later-on)

2. Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by informant-Mool Chand in the subject FIR, are that he had received a call on his mobile phone and thereafter, an amount of Rs.40,000/- had been withdrawn from his bank account through Paytm. During the investigation, a sum of Rs.5,000/- out of the said amount, is found to have been received in the bank account of the petitioner.

3. Status-report submitted on behalf of the respondent-State by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hathin, District Palwal, along-with Annexure R-1, is already available on the file and these documents are taken on the record.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also perused the file carefully.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is behind the bars since 30.06.2021 and the Challan has already been presented before the competent Court and the charges have been framed and even the trial has also commenced in the present case and moreover, the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case of the similar nature and in these circumstances, he (petitioner) deserves the relief as prayed for in this petition.
6. Learned State counsel does not dispute the afore-referred factual position.
7. Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the facts that the trial of the case is likely to take sufficient time to conclude and that no useful purpose will be served by detaining the petitioner in judicial custody any more and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petitioner named Sarfraj is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing the requisite personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.
8. The instant petition stands allowed accordingly.

12.09.2022
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>No</i>