



CRM-M-3360-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-3360-2025

Decided on: 27.01.2025

Rahul

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Saurabh Chobey, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirpal Singh Thakur, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.08 dated 19.04.2024, registered under Sections 120-B, 201, 420 & 406 IPC, at Police Station Cyber Police Station, Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Raunak Garg d/o Parmod Kumar. It was alleged that she was working as an Accountant Assistant in the BDPO office, Block Narnaul. On 04.04.2024, she joined a website through an advertisement link on Telegram. She was assigned a task of rating products. Thereafter, they gave her a bonus of Rs.500/-. On the next day, she was asked to purchase an agent pass, for which they charged Rs.10,000/-. After completion of the task, she was allowed to withdraw Rs.10,000/- plus Rs.2,666/- and thus, she was very well entrapped and finally she found that an amount of Rs.7 lacs was extracted from her under the pretext of withdrawal. Thereafter, they started demanding an additional amount of Rs.9,70,749/- for enabling further withdrawal. Finding fraud having been committed with her, she



made a request to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused. He was arrested on 26.10.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Narnaul, praying for grant of regular bail. However, learned Court after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner, dismissed the same vide order dated 02.01.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither the petitioner is named in the FIR nor there is any allegation made against him. He submits that the matter has been amicably resolved as compromise has been arrived at between the parties on 07.01.2025. It is submitted that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused Manoj Kumar, which is is not an admissible evidence. He has submitted that the investigation is already over and challan has been presented and thus, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in one more case of the similar nature. It is also submitted that recovery of mobile phone and cash was effected from the petitioner. He submits that in all there are five accused, out of which three accused have been arrested whereas two



CRM-M-3360-2025

-3-

accused are yet to be arrested. He submits that complaints from various victims have been received and thus, granting bail to the petitioner would adversely effect the ongoing trial at this stage. He, thus, submits that no case for grant of bail is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of Raunak Garg, wherein, it was alleged that Cyber offence was committed with her. During the investigation, total five accused were found to be involved, out of which only three accused could be arrested so far. The record would reflect that 57 complaints were received by the Police, where innocent people were cheated for an amount of Rs.3.5 crores. Custody certificate filed by the State would show that the petitioner is involved in one more case of the similar nature. Though challan is presented in this case, however, trial is at the initial stage. In view of the overall facts and circumstances, this Court finds no ground for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Hence, the present petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

6. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.01.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No