



225

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

CRM-M-23353-2025

Date of Decision:23.05.2025

SACHIN @ SACHIN YADAV

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Akash Vashisth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.239 dated 16.09.2021, registered under Sections 420, 120-B, 34 IPC & 66 of I.T. Act, Police Station Kosli, District Rewari.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not initially named in the FIR and the allegations were primarily targeted against Sachin Kumar son of Vinay Kumar and Pooja Yadav. He further contends that Sachin Kumar son of Vinay Kumar was arrested and he named the petitioner in his disclosure statement. He further submits that except the disclosure statement suffered by Sachin Kumar, there is no other evidence



against the petitioner. He further submits that Sachin Kumar son of Vinay Kumar now has been granted the concession of bail by the Court of Sessions Judge, Rewari on 04.06.2022. Moreover, Pooja Yadav has also been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 11.02.2025 and is in custody for the last more than 03 months. After completion of investigation, the challan has been filed by the police, but no witness has been examined so far.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused had leaked the papers of Air Force, DMRC, ITBP etc. by hacking the system and the petitioner was found connected telephonically with the other accused in the present case and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he does not dispute the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was named by Sachin son of Vinay Kumar in his disclosure statement and Sachin has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Court of Sessions Judge, Rewari vide order dated 04.06.2022 (Annexure P-4). Even, Pooja Yadav, who was named in the FIR, has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his



furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

23.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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