

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

254

**2024:PHHC:016385
CRM-M-54142-2023
Date of decision: February 06, 2024**

ANKIT YADAV
...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasleen Chahal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.15 dated 17.06.2023 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 120-B, 386, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Sonipat.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the role of the petitioner is almost akin to that of co-accused Tajinder Kumar, who has been extended the concession of bail by this Court vide order passed on even date. It has been further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 16.07.2023 and since the investigation in the case in hand is complete and even charges stand framed on 25.01.2024, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose as the prosecution evidence is yet to commence.
3. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record subject to just exceptions. A copy thereof has been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioner. While opposing the

prayer and submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not been able to dispute the factual aspect of the role attributed to the petitioner to the effect that he came to be nominated as an accused on the disclosure statement of co-accused Krishan Kumar. However, learned State counsel has submitted that during investigation, it had come to light that the petitioner had been collecting money on behalf of the prime accused-Krishan Kumar. Learned State counsel has not disputed the status of trial *qua* the challan having been presented and charges framed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.

5. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, since the investigation in the case in hand, which is based on documentary evidence, is complete, hence, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. This Court, therefore, deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner as the trial would take considerable time to conclude. The petition as such is allowed; the petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Needless to add here, in case the petitioner is found misusing the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to approach this Court to seek cancellation of bail to him.

February 06, 2024
Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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