



335

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1)

CRM-M-16003-2021
Date of decision: 01.08.2025

M/S YUPP TV USA INC

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

2)

CRM-M-17026-2021

M/S YUPP TV USA INC

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

3)

CRM-M-21366-2021

M/S YUPP TV USA INC

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr.Abhinav Sood, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. S.P.Sidhu, Advocate for the respondent(s).

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (ORAL)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
09	10.03.2021	Cyber Crime, Faridabad	63/69 of Copy Right Act, 1957 read with Section 420 of IPC, 1860

1. In all the above mentioned petitions common question of law and facts are involved, so all petitions are being disposed of by a common judgment. For brevity facts are being taken from CRM-M-16003-2021.

2. Seeking cancellation of bail granted to respondents No.2 and 3 in the FIR captioned above, the complainant has come up before this Court under Section 439(2) of the Code of



3. Vide order dated 05.04.2021, the trial court had granted bail to respondents No.2 and 3 on the grounds mentioned in the following paragraphs of the impugned order:

“Both the applicants-accused are in custody since 10.3.2021. Punishment for the offence punishable under section 63 of Copyright Act, 1957 is up to three years only. The question whether the offence punishable under section 420 of IPC is made out or not can only be ascertained at subsequent appropriate stage. Both the applicants are not the beneficiaries. Main allegations are against co-accused Harpreet Singh Randhawa. Therefore, keeping in view of above discussion and without commenting anything on the merits of the case the above said bail applications are hereby allowed. The applicants-accused are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds in the sum of Rs.1,00,000 with one local surety each, to the satisfaction of Ld. Illaqa/Duty Magistrate. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned LD. Illaqa/Duty Magistrate. A copy of this order be placed in connected bail application. Files be sent to the concerned Court for consignment purpose.”

4. Counsel for the respondent(s) submits that during the pendency of the petition, they did not violate any bail condition and did not repeat the offence. He further submits that they would have also no objection if this Court impose any other conditions also but the bail be not cancelled.

5. State counsel has not disputed the aforesaid factual aspect.

6. After arguing at length, counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that considering the fact that the petition relates to 2021, he would be contended and satisfied, if a direction is issued to the trial Court to expedite the trial as the respondent(s) are unnecessarily delaying the trial and although, the police report has been filed way back but charges have not been framed yet. Counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that he prays for similar direction in the connected petitions as facts are same.

7. Counsel for the private respondent(s) submits that they have no objection to such a request.

8. Given the precise prayer of the petitioner(s) and no objection to such prayer by private respondent(s), this Court is of the view that trial should be expedited in this case. Generally, this Court refrains from issuing such direction, because such direction disturb the docket of the



Court, but keeping in view the facts and circumstances of this case, trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and make efforts to conclude the trial as early as possible with the aforesaid observations, petitions stand disposed of. All pending applications(s), if any, stand disposed of.

9. Parties to brought this order to the notice of concerned trial Court.

01.08.2025
renubala

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

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