

CRM-M-34397-2023

::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CRM-M-34397-2023 (O & M)****Date of decision: 24.07.2023**

Adesh Soni and ors.

.... Petitioners

V/s

State of Haryana and anr.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ashwani Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.04 dated 03.10.2022 under Sections 120-B, 406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 469, 471 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Cyber Sonapat, District Sonapat, Haryana.

2. The brief facts of the case are that an application was moved by the complainant-Chanchal Rani, who reported that she had been working with the Railways Department and some of her known persons introduced her to Foreign Exchange Trading and assured her that she could get sufficient income from the trading business. She was provided a Whatsapp Number on which she spoke to certain persons who got her to open an

CRM-M-34397-2023

::2::

Rs.11,40,000/- on different occasions in the bank account. However, later on, she came to know that the Facebook I.D. and mobile numbers were forged and fabricated and someone had duped her by involving her in the trading business. On the basis of the complaint, the instant FIR came to be registered.

During investigation, the investigating agency found that an amount of Rs.12,80,000/- was transferred in a bank account in SBI through RTGS and Rs.3,40,000/- was transferred in an account in Yes Bank. When the details of the said accounts were checked, it was found that the said account was opened by Mahadev Fashions through its proprietor-Deepak Kumar Roy. At the time of opening of the said account, Deepak Roy had furnished an address which was found to be fake.

It was also found that one Vikram had opened a bank account in the name of Maha Laxmi Services in IDFC Bank and when the said Vikram was joined in investigation, he disclosed that he was asked by Pukhraj Vaishnav (since granted bail vide order dated 14.07.2023 passed in CRM-M-32494-2023) to open the account. Subsequently, Pukhraj Vaishnav was joined in investigation and on the basis of his disclosure statement, the accused Adesh Soni (petitioner No.1), Raghav Soni (since granted bail vide order dated 30.05.2023 passed in CRM-M-26553-2023, Annexure P-10) and others were arrested. The co-accused-Raghav Soni suffered his disclosure statement that in March 2022, he had come in contact with Razzak (petitioner No.4) who allured him to open an account in the name of a fake firm to earn profit and thus, he met with one Ankit who was also asked to open an account and a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- was paid and he (Raghav Soni)

CRM-M-34397-2023

::3::

disclosed that Ankit, Adesh Soni (petitioner No.1) and Pukhraj had opened a forged firm account on the basis of fake documents and the kit was being transferred from one person to another who used to take his commission and forward the kit to the other. As per his disclosure statement he had allured Vikram to open an account in the name of Maha Laxmi Services and after opening of the account, Vikram had handed over all the documents such as cheque book, ATM card, Net Banking, user name and password to him (Raghav Soni) and he transferred the said kit to the other co-accused.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that a compromise has been effected between them and the complainant. As the petitioners were in custody since 01.03.2023, the investigation stood completed and none of the 10 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far, they were entitled to the grant of bail, moreso, when two of their co-accused, namely, Raghav Soni and Pukhraj Vaishnav had been granted the similar concession.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that serious allegations had been levelled against the petitioners and their co-accused. Cyber crime was on the rise and criminals such as the petitioners did not deserve any sympathy. Therefore, the concession of bail ought not to be granted to them. He, however, does not dispute the fact that the challan stands submitted and none of the 10 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far.

5. The learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, submits that in terms of the compromise/affidavit (Annexure P-9), he has no objection if the petitioners are granted the concession of bail.

CRM-M-34397-2023

::4::

7. Admittedly, the petitioners are in custody since 01.03.2023, the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. stands submitted, and thereafter, none of the 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. Further, a compromise has been effected between the parties in terms of which the complainant has stated that she would have no objection if the petitioners are granted the concession of bail. Co-accused, namely, Raghav Soni and Pukhraj Vaishnav have been granted the similar concession.

8. In view of the above, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioners No.1 to 4, namely, Adesh Soni, Deepak Pilada, Mansha Puri Goswami and Rajjak Mohammad Mansuri, are ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The petitioners shall appear on the first Monday of every month before the police station concerned till the conclusion of the trial and furnish an affidavit each time that they are not involved in any case/crime other than the present one.

10. In addition, the petitioners (or someone on their behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- each and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

July 24, 2023
sukhpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No