

CRM-M-64219-2025

2025:PHHC:176058



205

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

CRM-M-64219-2025

Jitender

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

Date of decision: December 19, 2025

Date of Uploading: December 19, 2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Bhaskar Sorout, Advocate and
Mr. Parmish Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.241 dated 20.06.2025, for the offence punishable under Sections 316(5), 318(4) & 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), Sections 65 & 66D of the Information and Technology Act and Sections 7, 13(1)(a) & 13(1)(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Nissing, District Karnal.

2. The gravamen of allegations against the petitioner is that a *tehrir* was received at Police Station Nissing, District Karnal, on the basis of

CRM-M-64219-2025

a complaint submitted by Pinki, District Citizen Resources Information Department (CRID), alleging illegal tampering with the online Family ID (PPP ID) portal. The complainant stated that during the course of her official duties, she received confidential information indicating that Ankit Kumar, ZCRIM, Nissing, appointed by the Citizen Resources Information Department, in connivance with certain Common Service Centers (CSCs), had been illegally sharing the user ID and password of the PPP ID portal with CSC operators in exchange for monetary consideration, thereby enabling unauthorized tampering of the portal. It was further alleged that the co-accused, namely, Ankit Kumar had, on multiple occasions, shared his official ZCRIM login credentials with Sunny CSC Centre and other CSCs. The complainant stated that if the official computer of the said co-accused, located at Municipal Committee, Nissing, along with his social media accounts, were examined, incriminating evidence related to the said illegal activities could be recovered.

Upon finding the confidential information to be credible, the complainant informed her senior officers and, pursuant to their directions, visited MC Nissing at about 04:50 PM along with Arun Kumar, Security Analyst, HPPA Panchkula, appointed by the department. During inspection of the official computer of co-accused, namely, Ankit Kumar, ZCRIM, Nissing, it was found that multiple OTPs related to the official login ID of the PPP ID portal had been shared.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 24.06.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the

CRM-M-64219-2025

petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further iterated that prime evidence, available with the prosecution, against the petitioner, is disclosure statement by co-accused, namely, Ankit, which is untenable in law. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner was not involved directly into the working of the office, whereby alleged offence taken place. Learned counsel has urged that the petitioner is a man with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 18.12.2025 in the Court today, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 24.06.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan has been presented on 17.09.2025. Total 17 prosecution witnesses have been cited, but none has been examined till date. It is thus, indubitable that conclusion of the trial will its own time. The rival contention raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to

CRM-M-64219-2025

indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. As per custody certificate dated 18.12.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 05 months and 25 days, & is not shown to be involved in any other FIR(s).

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

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

CRM-M-64219-2025

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

9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

December 19, 2025
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No