

2025:PHHC:154772



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.38966 of 2025
Date of Decision: 10.11.2025
Reserved on: 03.11.2025

Abhay Saxena ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
73	16.09.2024	Cyber Crime Police Station, Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar	318(4) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Gurujot Singh alleging that on 25.07.2024, he received a call on his mobile phone and the caller while disclosing that he was a representative of Fedex Courier Company,

2025:PHHC:154772



disclosed to him that he had sent a parcel containing some articles from Mumbai to Russia which had been caught by the Customs Department and that contraband had been recovered from the same. The complainant responded by telling him that no such parcel had been sent by him. The caller by saying that it could be a case of leak of his Aadhar Card details, told him that he was transferring his call to the Mumbai Crime Branch. Then he was made to talk to some other person who introduced himself as SI Ajay Bansal from Mumbai Crime Branch. That the said person took him to his video call, digitally arrested him and by blackmailing him, got transferred an amount of Rs.8,48,925/- from the bank account of the complainant to a particular bank account. Later on, the complainant realized that a fraud had been committed with him and he was duped of the aforementioned amount of money.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated which revealed that the aforementioned amount was transferred in bank account No.20512935706 of State Bank of India Branch by way of two transactions and from the same and thereafter, an amount of Rs.3,95,000/- was transferred to the bank account of accused Ameen Ali and the said amount had been withdrawn by the complainant by way of a self cheque on 25.07.2024. The petitioner was accordingly nominated as accused along with the co-accused Ameen Ali. One Kapil Chauhan was also nominated as such. The petitioner and the co-accused were arrested on 17.06.2025.

Investigation now stands completed.

2025.PHHC.154772



4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. No money was transferred in his account. Infact, he was only an employee of accused Ameen and his Aadhar Card had been misused by the accused Ameen without his knowledge for the purpose of withdrawing money. The details of his Aadhar Card had been submitted by the petitioner with accused Ameen for the purpose of gaining employment. The mobile phone number from which the complainant had received calls did not belong to him. He is not beneficiary of the transaction. No recovery has been effected from him. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He has clean antecedents. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view of the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance of that conspiracy, the complainant was kept under digital arrest and cyber fraud/crime was committed with him by extending threat to him on the premise that some contraband had been recovered from a parcel allegedly sent by him from Mumbai to Russia and then he was made to transfer an amount of Rs.8,48,925/- by way of blackmailing him in the bank account of one of the accomplices of the

2025:PHHC:154772



petitioner and the co-accused. The investigation has revealed that an amount of Rs.3,95,000/- was transferred in the bank account of the co-accused Ameen Ali and by way of a self cheque, it was the petitioner who had withdrawn the same. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the subject crime, however, in the opinion of this Court, the pre trial incarceration should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing. The petitioner is in custody since 17.06.2025. He is not involved in any other case. The well settled proposition of law is that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. The personal liberty is a precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case. Continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. It is equally well settled that when an undertrial prisoner is detained in jail for an indefinite period, Article 21 of the Constitution is violated. Reliance in this regard can be had to the observations made by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sanjay Chandra v. CBI*, 2011 SCC OnLine SC 1502. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the further incarceration of the petitioner would be of no justifiability and the petitioner has made out a case for grant of bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds as well as surety bonds by two sureties in the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned and further subject to the condition that he will mention his



personal identification details of passport number, if any, his cell phone number, Aadhar Card and his permanent residence as well as the present residential address, if any. He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

8. It is also clarified that the observations made hereinabove are not an expression of opinion on the merits of the case nor the trial Court shall advert to the comments made herein and that the prosecution will be entitled to seek cancellation of bail, if the petitioner violates any of the conditions as laid down upon him.

10.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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