



217

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

CRM-M-27394-2025

Date of decision :11.08.2025

Sukhdeep Singh**....Petitioner**

versus

State of Haryana**..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Rohit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.20 dated 20.04.2024, under Sections 406, 419 & 420 of IPC (Sections 120-B, 201, 467, 468 & 471 of IPC and Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 added during investigation), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Ambala.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the present case was registered on the statement complainant, namely, Renu Jain. It was alleged that in the month of January 2024, she had opened a Demat Account in Kotak Company and started trading of shares and invested a huge amount. The accused persons in-connivance with each other have cheated her on-line for crores of rupees under the garb of on-line trading in share market. The request was made to take the legal action against all the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of petitioner was surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of Neha Saini and Bhajan Lal. The petitioner was arrested on 06.05.2024.



He approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit and after hearing both the sides, the same was declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala vide order dated 07.02.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-16085-2025 but the same was dismissed being not pressed vide order dated 28.03.2025 passed by this Court. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely prosecuted in the present case. He submits that present FIR has been lodged on the complaint of one complainant, Renu Jain. It is submitted that from the bare reading of the allegations made in the FIR, it is apparent that the allegations were made against Sarvesh Srivastava and Maya Salem. It was alleged that the petitioner had been trapped by them on giving lucrative offers. The complainant opened a Demat account and thereafter, she started depositing the amount in that account. The total amount thus, paid by the complainant was about Rs.2 crores. He submits that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor any allegations were made against him. It is submitted that during investigation the petitioner was arrested on 06.05.2024 and since then he is behind bars. To buttress his arguments, he submits that in all there are 21 accused persons out of which except the petitioner, all are on bail and the role of the petitioner is not distinguishable from other co-accused who have been granted bail. He submits that the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. It is submitted that investigation is complete and charges are framed, thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation. He submits that during investigation, on the asking of the petitioner, the complainant had deposited the amount on various dates in the account of one Neha Matolia and further the transferred amount was found in the account of Neha Saini and Bhajan Lal, the are employees of the petitioner. He thus, submits that the prima facie complicity of the petitioner was proved in the present case. However, he endorsed the fact that out of 21 accused persons, rest of the 20 accused are on bail. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it transpires that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, on 06.05.2024. As submitted before this Court, the investigation is complete and charges are framed. Admittedly, out of 21 accused persons, rest 20 accused are on bail. The role of all these accused persons has been said to be on similar footing. The custody certificate produced would show that he has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 13 days as on 11.08.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. As submitted before this Court, out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and



circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.08.2025

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

ps-I

JUDGE

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