



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

106

CRM-M-60003-2024

Date of decision: 21st November, 2025

Parveen @ Parveen Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ved Parkash, Senior DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 33 dated 26.11.2023 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471 and 204 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Cyber Crime Kurukshetra, District Kurukshetra.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by Jagdish Singh, who was a victim of cyber crime, who was allured through social media to invest money online in a particular company and was induced to part with a sum of ₹75,94,631/- which was got deposited online by him in various accounts. It was only later that he realised that a calculated fraud had been played upon him.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were



initiated, and it was revealed that an amount of ₹1,05,200/- out of the money transferred from the bank account of the complainant was deposited in an account in the name of the present petitioner. He was arrested on 12.12.2023 and interrogated. He disclosed that on the asking of co-accused Yadwinder Singh, he had constituted a firm under the name and style of “Parveen Welding Works” and had opened a bank account in the name of the said firm. He further disclosed that the passbook, ATM card, and mobile SIM card registered for that account were handed over to Yadwinder Singh *in lieu* of a sum of ₹30,000/-. The co-accused Yadwinder was also nominated as an accused and was subsequently arrested, along with some other persons. Apart from this, the petitioner had also opened other bank accounts in his name in HDFC Bank, IndusInd Bank, Bank of Maharashtra, and the State Bank of India, in different branches of so-and-so. The passbooks, ATM cards, and other details of those accounts were handed over to the co-accused Yadwinder Singh, who used to convert the money earned from online fraud into USDT wallets and digital currency and further transfer it into some other accounts. The investigation now stands completed, and challan has been presented in the Court.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 12.12.2023. He had never made any call to the complainant, nor had taken any money from him. He was not directly involved in the offence. He was not named in the FIR. The amount of money which was deposited in the bank account of the firm constituted by him had not been withdrawn by him but by the co-accused Yadwinder. His further incarceration would not serve any useful



purpose. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The co-accused Tejender Kumar, Sagar, Yadwinder, and Gaurav have been extended the benefit of bail. On the ground of parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. *Per contra*, the State counsel has vehemently argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. An amount of ₹3,14,79,737/- was deposited in the bank account opened by him, and the said amount was the money received by defrauding innocent persons. One more case of similar nature has been registered against the petitioner, and he is a habitual offender. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding if extended the benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner was a part of the syndicate run by the co-accused, involved in inducing innocent persons to invest their hard-earned money online and defrauding them. He is alleged to have opened bank accounts and provided the details of the same to co-accused Yadwinder. Some of the co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. The petitioner is in custody since 12.12.2023. The trial has commenced but will obviously take considerable time, as none out of the 46 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. It is a well-settled proposition of law that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentence and should not be punitive. Taking into consideration the above-discussed facts, but without making any comment on the merits of the case, the petition is



allowed, and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail, subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds, including two sureties, to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate/CJM concerned.

8. However, in addition to the conditions to be imposed by the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, the release of the petitioner shall also be subject to the following conditions :-

- (i) the petitioner shall not misuse the liberty granted;
- (ii) the petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial Court;
- (iii) the petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (iv) the petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of the concerned police station and shall not change the same without prior permission to the trial Court.
- (v) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

9. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the



State/complainant shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

10. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

11. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

21st November, 2025

Parveen Sharma

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned*
- 2. Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*