



CRM-M-12778-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-12778-2025

Date of decision: 18.02.2026

SHARIQ BEAG

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

..RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.09, dated 15.04.2023, under Sections 420, 406, 201, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Cyber Jhajjar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant-Karan. It was alleged that he received a message on his whatsapp wherein he was allured by the caller to deposit an amount and he was assigned different tasks and in return would get good reward. He kept on depositing the amount and different tasks were assigned to him. However, after paying the amount of Rs. 1,80,000/-, he was found to have been cheated. Though he requested the return of the amount, the same was not returned, and he was found to have been cheated in a cyber offence. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, namely, Arshad Beg. Thus, he was arrested on 19.01.2024. He approached the learned Additional

**CRM-M-12778-2025****-2-**

sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned learned Additional Sessions Judge, District Jhajjar declined the bail application vide order dated 25.07.2024. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any overt act been attributed to him. However, he has been implicated in this case during the investigation on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. He further submits that the complainant alleged that he was cheated of Rs. 1,80,000/-, whereas in the account alleged to belong to the petitioner, there was only a transaction of Rs. 80,000/-. He further submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 19.01.2024 and he is involved in 03 more cases, however, he has been acquitted in one case. Thus, in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation. Out of total amount of Rs.1,80,000/-, an amount of Rs.80,000/- was found to have been deposited in the account of the petitioner. He further submits that petitioner is a habitual offender who is facing prosecution in other cases of the similar nature. He, on instructions, submits that there are total 07 accused, however, 06 accused have already been granted. He further submits that investigation is completed, however, charges are yet to be framed as one of the accused is absconding. He produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same are taken on record.

6. Heard.

**CRM-M-12778-2025****-3-**

deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 19.01.2024. The complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation. There are total 07 accused, however, 06 accused have already been granted bail. The investigation has been completed. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioners have completed incarceration of 02 year, 01 month and 13 days. He is involved in 03 more cases, however, he has been acquitted in one case

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the stage of the trial, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. The learned Court is directed to ensure that local surety is furnished by the petitioner at the time of submission of bail/surety bonds. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the both the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

18.02.2026  
*renubala*

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

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