



CRM-M-15340-2025

-1-

213-2

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-15340-2025
Date of Decision: 02.09.2025**

SIKANDER SINGH ALIAS YUSUF ANSARI

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate and
Mr. Ritesh Grover, Advocate (Through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS, 2023') seeking grant of regular bail in FIR No. 131 dated 20.09.2023 under Section 66-D of Information and Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 and Section 420 IPC (later on added Sections 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC) registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Gururgram.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has not been named in the FIR but has been nominated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by the co-accused namely Pradeep alias Sonu. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 08.11.2023. Learned counsel further submits that the trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time as out of total 23 prosecution witnesses only one who is complainant has been examined. He prays that the petitioner be released on regular bail



CRM-M-15340-2025

-2-

during the pendency of the trial.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that if he is released on bail he will certainly indulge in similar activities again. Learned State counsel further contended that the petitioner is a member of inter-state cyber crime gang and involved in several cases as per status report but does not dispute the fact that in the present case out of total twenty three witnesses only one has been examined till date.

4. Faced with this, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition while limiting his prayer to the extent that a direction be given to the trial Court to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible.

5. Permitted to do so.

6. Petition is dismissed as withdrawn with a direction to the trial Court to conclude the trial within a period of two months from the next date fixed therein as stipulated under Section 437(6) Cr.P.C. (Section 480(6) of BNSS) However, it is made clear that delay is not tribute on the part of accused person in case the trial Court fails to do so, the petitioner will be at liberty to move an application for bail and the trial Court will decide the same.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

02.09.2025

Sima

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>