



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

CRM-M-4449-2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Neeraj Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Bhavdeep Singh Mamli, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, DAG, Haryana.

Vinod S. Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.193 dated 21.07.2025, registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, (Section 66 of Information Technology Act, 2000 subsequently added), at Police Station Cyber Manesar, District Gurugram. The earlier bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 17.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-63515-2025.

2. As per the prosecution case the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Manoj Kumar son of Satyendra Kumar who stated that he was allured into joining a group on Telegram application and making investment in a trading company promising good profits. The said investment was, however, siphoned off, thus, resulting in the complainant



losing out a sum of Rs.4 lakh vide ten different transactions done by him.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no role to play in the alleged offence. As a matter of fact, a sum of Rs.2 lakh has been received in the account of one Surender Kumar, who nominated Kuldeep Singh @ Rinku and Neeraj Kumar-petitioner herein in his disclosure and submitted that he had sold the account to them. It is submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 01.09.2025 and he has already undergone custody of nearly 08 months. The offences are triable by the Court of a Magistrate and the prosecution evidence has yet not commenced, thus, conclusion of trial will take a sufficiently long time and further detention of the petitioner is unwarranted.

4. Learned State counsel contends that it is the petitioner who further sold the account to one, Balram for a sum of Rs.25,000/-, who has not yet been arrested. The rest of the contentions are not disputed.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, but taking into consideration the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the nature of allegations and the case being triable by the Court of Magistrate and also noticing that the conclusion of trial will take long time, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.



7. Anything observed here-in-above shall not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case pending before the trial Court.

29.04.2026
SN

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No