



CRM-M-36491 of 2025

1

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

239

CRM-M-36491 of 2025

Date of decision: 17.07.2025

Mohd Sohail

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS of 2023 in case FIR No.121 dated 01.09.2024, under Sections 318(4) (erstwhile Section 420) BNS, 2023, Section 61(2)A (erstwhile Section 120-B), 238 (erstwhile Section 201) BNS, 2023 (added during investigation), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime Central, Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Case of the prosecution is petitioner along with his co-accused were indulging in cyber crime by alluring the complainant to invest money in a promotion of the company called Prestige Group Company. Thereafter, money along with profit was not returned to the investors. It is stated that some of the amount was deposited in the account of the present petitioner and thereafter, the same was transferred to the other account which was being operated by co-accused Sheikh Mohd. Faizan.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and petitioner himself has not used even a single penny which was deposited in his account. The petitioner is in custody



for the last 10 months and 1 day and trial is yet to commence. Trial is likely to take time for its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, Addl. A. G. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate dated 16.07.2025, the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 1 day.

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

7. In view of the above submission of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that trial is yet to commence and the same is likely to take a long time, the continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners misuse the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

17.07.2025
anil

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