



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(232) CRM-M-40779-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 05.08.2025

Geeta Rani Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.101 dated 12.11.2024 under Sections 318(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 66-D of Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 35, 36 of the Haryana Parivar Pehchan Act, 2021 (Sections 316(5), 238(C), 61 of BNS, 2023 and Section 65 of Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 7, 13(1) (a), 13(1) (b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 added later on) registered at Police Station Cyber Crime Jhajjar, District Jhajjar (Haryana).

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that the complainant, namely, Yogesh Kumar, who is now the accused in the case, was the Information Manager, District Civil Resources Department, Jhajjar. It was informed by him to the police that for change in family ID due to divorce, the applicant was required to apply on the portal and upon receipt of any such application, verification about the requisite documents is conducted and



::2::

thereafter, the application is either accepted or the same is rejected. On dated 03.11.2024, while working in the login, he came to know that by hacking the related portal and misusing in an illegal manner that portal by unknown persons, the application for change of family ID have wrongly been accepted by issuing new family IDs. After checking on the portal, applications about 12 in number relating to change in Family Identity Cards, were found on the portal. Information in this regard was given to Additional Deputy Commissioner, Jhajjar and CRID Headquarter through E-mail on 04.11.2024. Thereafter, on dated 08.11.2024, Additional Deputy Commissioner, Jhajjar directed SHO, Cyber Crime, Jhajjar to register an FIR. On registration of FIR, it was revealed that the petitioner-accused were indulging in making illegal, unlawful and unwarranted changes in the family IDs and without discharging their duties of verification of the requisite documents. Finding the complicity of the accused Yogesh and Geeta, they were arrested in the case, which initially was registered for offences under Section 416(5), 318(4), 61 of BNS & 66 of IT Act as well Section 35 & 36 of HPP Act. During investigation, the offences under Section 7, 13(1)(a) & 13(1)(b) of Prevention of Corruption Act, were found to be attracted and were added accordingly.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of her co-accused/Yogesh who was initially a complainant. The petitioner was engaged by the Citizen Resources Information Department (CRID), Haryana on Ad hoc/Contractual basis for the period of 01.06.2024 to 31.05.2025. Her



::3::

operational duties were confined strictly to that of being a Data Entry Operator and the offence, if any, has been committed by her co-accused Yogesh Kumar who was her superior authority. As the petitioner is in custody since 24.01.2025 but none of the 29 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, she is entitled to the concession of bail, moreso, when two of her co-accused, namely, Vikash and Sikander have been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide a common order dated 23.07.2025 (Annexure P-1).

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that the investigation has revealed that the petitioner and her co-accused have committed the offence in question. Therefore, she is not entitled to the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 24.01.2025, none of the 29 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and that two co-accused have been granted the concession of bail.

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 during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 24.01.2025 but none of the 29 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required, moreso, when two co-accused have been granted the similar relief.



::4::

7. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Geeta Rani is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on her 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 present petition stands disposed of.

11. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

August 05, 2025
kusum/sukhpreet

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