



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

Sr.No.226

**CRM-M-4072-2026
Decided on : 18.04.2026**

Sanjay Bhalsay alias Sanjay Bhasle

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Mukul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0081 dated 13.11.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340, 61 of the BNS, 2023, at Police Station Cyber Crime, Sonipat.
2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with co-accused had committed cyber fraud and duped the complainant for a sum of Rs.1,20,85,089/-. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further



contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and he has no concern with the said offence. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been made as a scape-goat in this case and he has no involvement in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner never contacted or communicated with the complainant. It has been contended that there is no direct evidence to connect the petitioner with the said offence. It is further submitted that the matter has been compromised between the parties. The petitioner is in custody since 04.12.2025 and he has clean antecedents. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have been framed. Learned counsel further submits that out of 08 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He further submits that trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate which is taken on record. The status report has already been filed. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He submits that he is not aware of any compromise effected between the parties. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has appeared today in court and filed his power of attorney, which is taken on record. He does not dispute the factum of compromise and has not opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody



for the last more than 04 months and 14 days; compromise has been effected between the parties; the investigation in this case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of 08 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in further custody. His further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon’ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.04.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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