



236

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

CRM-M No.35536 of 2025

Date of Decision : 03.12.2025

Dinesh**.....Petitioner**

versus

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

Present :- Mr. Randhir S. Thind, Advocate and
Mr. Arpinder S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0024, dated 31.12.2023, under Sections 406, 420 of IPC, 1860 (Section 120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Cyber Police Station Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Himanshi, wife of Rishabh Gupta. It was alleged that on 22.12.2023, the complainant saw an advertisement on the *Instagram* titled as 'Work from Home'. The complainant clicked the link which led to a Telegram ID under the name of Lavanya. The details were collected and thereafter, she was assigned 20



tasks each day. She was assigned tasks on the website and was required to take the screen shots. The return profit to the deposit money was 30%. In this way, she earned Rs.3700/-. She was asked for payments time and again, and thus, she sent amounts of Rs.10,000/-, Rs.30,000/-, Rs.50,000/-, Rs.50,000/- and Rs.50,000/-, in different accounts under the guise of completing different tasks. Thereafter she was informed that she had earned the profit of Rs.2,80,900/- and the same would be credited in her account after paying the tax of Rs.84,270/-. She refused to pay the tax and realized that she has been cheated for an amount of Rs.1,90,000/- and thus, the complaint was lodged. On the basis of the complaint, the present FIR has been lodged. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 11.12.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Narnaul praying for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Narnaul, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 05.03.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-16953-2025 praying for the grant of bail, however the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 02.04.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of bail.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither the petitioner is named in the FIR nor any overt act has been alleged against him. He has submitted that however during the investigation, the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 11.12.2024. He has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case and the material witnesses already stand examined. He has submitted that as per the investigation, the account in which the transactions have been found, was not in the name of petitioner. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that it is the petitioner, who had provided the account to the co-accused and in the account provided by the petitioner to the co-accused, there is a transaction of Rs.1,90,000/-. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 09 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused during the investigation. The account, in which transaction is there, is in the name of



co-accused. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 11.12.2024. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 11 months and 19 days as on 01.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of total 09 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have been examined so far.

8. The veracity of the allegations and counter allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, 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 on parity.

10. 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.

03.12.2025
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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