



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.25328 of 2024
Date of decision: 27th August, 2024

Vikas @ Vicky
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
... Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. N. K. Ganga, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.13 dated 16.11.2023 under Sections 406, 420 of the IPC registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Sirsa.
2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 18.05.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that a perusal of the FIR (annexed as Annexure P-1) reveals that he is neither named therein nor any suspicion raised qua his involvement in the crime in question. Learned counsel has also submitted that it is not even the case of the



complainant that he had operated the account in question and furthermore the account in question in which the alleged transactions were carried out; the accounts were not even in the name of the petitioner but in the name of the co-accused on whose disclosure statement he was arraigned as an accused. Learned counsel submits that co-accused Parvinder Singh has already been extended the concession of interim bail by the learned Trial Court. The petitioner too was extended the concession of interim bail by the learned Trial Court, however, it had been eventually dismissed only on the ground that he had not fully cooperated with the investigating agency. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is willing and ready to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 18.05.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. She, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 18.05.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid



down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

August 27, 2024
rps

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