

S. No.221

2025:PHHC:133763



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

CRM-M-47981 of 2025

Date of Decision:24.09.2025

Sahrukh Ahmed

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present:- Mr. Farukh Abdullah, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition filed under Section 483 BNSS read with Section 528 BNSS Act, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.41 dated 06.09.2024 registered under Section 318(4) BNS at Police Station Cyber Crime Rewari.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the Police by Dheeraj son of Chander Shekhar, with the allegations that on 20.07.2024, he received a friend request from Emily Johnson which was accepted by him and he talked on whatsapp No.+2348169625216. Complainant was jobless and he wanted to go abroad and the caller agreed to arrange a visa for him for going to USA. Later on, he was told that his visa has been sent at the Airport but he will have to pay amount for getting the visa released from the airport authority. He fell in the trap and he transferred a sum of Rs.14,26,500/- in their account from his different bank accounts but no visa was arranged for him and he sought action against the persons who had cheated him. The matter was investigated. Copies of statements of bank account of the complainant as well as beneficiary accounts were obtained. It was found that beneficiary account in Canara Bank was owned



by Ravikant son of Mahender Singh and a sum of Rs.2,13,000/- had been transferred in the said account from the account of the victim. On 11.06.2025, said Ravikant was arrested and on interrogation, he admitted his involvement and disclosed the name of present petitioner – Sharukh Ahmed and he also disclosed that he had given his account to present petitioner for a sum of Rs.1500/-. On 11.06.2025, present petitioner was arrested and he also admitted his involvement in the commission of crime. He disclosed that he had got opened an account in the name of Ravikant in Canara Bank, Badot and kept his passbook with him and after few days, he again got an account opened in the name of Ravikant in Maharashtra Bank, Baghpat and he kept that account with himself and thereafter, he started using Phone Pay etc. on it. He further deposed that he went to Delhi and there he became acquainted with one person, namely, Rajiv and later, he used to talk to him on whatsapp. Thereafter, said Rajiv gave him Rs.5,000/- and took the passbook and ATM of Canara Bank and also photograph of Ravikant's Aadhar card, PAN card etc., and got purchased an LED a fridge for him. During investigation, it was found that complainant's money has been transferred in 17 different accounts and complainant was cheated of a sum of Rs.14,26,500/- transferred on the pretext of arranging visa for USA.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on file.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He never met the complainant or induced him to pay to him any amount and as per



his disclosure statement, he had received Rs.5,000/- from co-accused Rajiv. Learned counsel contended that the petitioner is in custody since 12.06.2025. All the offences are Magisterial trial. He is not involved in any other case. Challan has already been presented after completion of investigation. Conclusion of the trial is going to take some more time and no useful purpose will be served by detaining him in custody.

5. Learned State Counsel has opposed the bail in view of the gravity of offence.

6. Petitioner had not induced the complainant to deliver any amount to him and it has been found during investigation that he was paid Rs.5,000/- only by the co-accused Rajiv. Petitioner is in custody since 12.06.2025. Challan has already been presented after completion of investigation. The offences are question are triable by Magistrate. Trial will take a long time to conclude and as such, no useful purpose will be served by keeping him in custody anymore.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything upon the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

September 24, 2025

renu

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No