

213 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025.PHHC:170003



CRM-M-67358-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.12.2025

ANSHU SINGH

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Atul Guglani, Advocate and
Mr. Deepak Guglani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No. 41 dated 30.12.2023, under Sections 419, 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Kurukshetra.

2. Briefly, the facts of the case are that complainant received a call from some person presenting himself as an Advocate Jagmohan Singh and informed the complainant that the nephew of the complainant, namely, Shibu has met with a car accident with an Englishman and the condition of the Englishman is critical and his nephew would be in trouble if Rs. 2,20,000/- is not paid to him. Thereafter, the complainant deposited some amount in the bank account, which was of the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner was not aware that his bank account was being misused as he did not have access to his account. He further submits that the main accused has not been arrested yet. However, the petitioner, being an employee of the main accused is in custody for more than 08 months.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 08 months and 14 days. Out of total 7 prosecution witnesses, only 1 witness has been examined so far.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Considering the submissions of the learned State Counsel and the fact that out of total 7 prosecution witnesses, only 1 witness has been examined; the petitioner is not involved in any other case; the petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 08 months and 14 days, therefore, continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

05.12.2025

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