(231)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32495-2025
Date of Decision: 04.09.2025

BALLI VERMA ALIAS KRISHAN MURARI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Abhishek Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

****

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.154 dated 13.11.2024 registered under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340, 61(2), 238(C) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Cyber Crime, Ballabgarh, District Faridabad.

2. The brief facts of the case are that that the complainant Ms. Shubhangi Gupta was added in a WhatsApp Group, with the name of Synergy Syndicate on 10.11.2024. She (i.e. the complainant) checked the Google ratings of the Group, which claimed itself to be Randstand India, contacted a number given in that Group on the next day and the person introduced herself as Shruti. Another number was also shared with her (i.e. the complainant). HR Shruti asked her details and gave a Telegram Link to her, to withdraw money and also gave a salary code LKYCXXX. On clicking the Telegram link given to her, she got connected to an account named-Bella

User name-@faopfww. Then her HR gave her salary code and another Telegram group link, with the name of B29 Google Working Group Digital Market. That Group had around 200 members sharing screenshots of people receiving money in their accounts on completing the tasks. Then she was asked to provide her UPI ID, to transfer money and transferred a sum of Rs.120/- to her account (i.e. of the complainant). In the next task, the Group asked her to invest money and promised profits. She was given 3-4 UPI IDs which were not working for her as such, she (i.e. the complainant) asked for another and invested a sum of Rs.2000/- in the UPI ID with the name of ali ashher. Then she was given another Telegram App. And made to join another site thereby requiring to make an account on the said site, which she did. Then she was asked to share the current balance showing on that site. She shared the screenshot showing zero balance, then asked to refresh upon which the balance was Rs.2700/-. She was asked to follow the instructions; gave her withdrawal code and asked to contact Bella. She did so, provided her account details, as required and Rs.2700/- was transferred to her account (i.e. of the complainant) after some time. Then she was asked to invest Rs.5000/- again and get back Rs.7500/-. Accordingly, she invested Rs.5000/- in the UPI ID named bajrang lal. She was asked to contact the teacher again, as earlier but he sent a message saying that she could not withdraw the said task, in between. Upon raising a question that the said fact was not told, earlier before investing Rs.5000/- in the said task, she was told that the teacher must have informed her about the said fact. Then that teacher told her that it was a group task and needed three other members too and asked her to join a group. That telegram group had five members including her (i.e. the complainant). She was asked to check the balance from the site and was asked to follow order 1 which required her to pay Rs.32,000/- with 50% profit, to which she said that she had no money and wanted her Rs.5000/-, back but she was refused on the plea that she needed to complete the whole task first. She was informed that she would get back total of Rs.55,500/- if she completed her further task. In the said manner, she kept on investing money, on the requirement of the unknown Group Admn. and others with assurance that she would then only get back her money, but to no avail as ultimately, her balance was shown to be zero and account frozen. Upon that she was required to pay more money, to get her account repaired and get her funds back. Only then did she realize that it was a scam.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The only role of the petitioner is that an amount of Rs.75,000/- was received in his account in two instalments from the account of the complainant. In fact, he is a street hawker. His co-accused Shlok Nichrele coerced him into using his bank account for which he received a sum of Rs.3000/-. As the petitioner is a first-time offender, in custody since 16.12.2024 but none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the present case is one of a cyber offence. The complainant was tricked into

investing a sum of Rs.2,42,500/- into a WhatsApp Group account with an intention to cheat. The nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner do not entitle him to the concession of bail. He, however concedes that the petitioner is a first-time offender, in custody since 16.12.2024 but none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is a first-time offender, in custody since 16.12.2024 but none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner-Balli Verma @ Krishan Murari S/o Manoharlal Verma is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the present case.

9. The petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same

would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

10. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

04.09.2025

JITESH

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