219+225

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

1. CRM-M-10637-2026

Mohit .....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana ..... Respondent

2. CRM-M-16670-2026

Abhishek Yadav ....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana ....Respondent

Date of decision: 21.05.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amit Siwach, Advocate and
Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Present petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.283 dated 04.08.2025, under Sections 318(4), 319, 61(2), 241 of BNS, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Gurugram.

3. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of complainant Rajat Arora. It was alleged in last week of May, 2025, he came in contact with a lady namely, Shweta on a dating app Hinge. The lady told her name as Kiara Hooda and she was using Mobile No.9695651029. She gradually gained trust of the complainant and claimed

that she has been trading on online platform from past five years. Trusting her advise, complainant joined trading website and initially invested Rs.50,000/-, on which platform showed that he has earned profit of US dollars 60 (approximately Rs.5300) and the complainant was able to successfully withdraw the same. This created sense of legitimacy in the mind of the complainant. Between dated 02.06.2025 to 31.07.2025, complainant made, a total of 32 transactions in multiple accounts as told to him and thus, he transferred a total sum of Rs.2,44,40,110/-. It was alleged that on 01.08.2025, platform showed that his investment has more than Rs.25.5 crores and when he wanted to withdraw the amount, complainant was asked to first deposit 30% of the tax as an exchange fee. At that time, complainant realized that he has been defrauded. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioners were arrested on 28.09.2025 and 06.10.2025, respectively. They approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing counsel for the parties and finding no merits, the same were declined vide orders dated 13.02.2026 and 20.12.2025, respectively. Being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions.

4. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present cases. It is submitted that the petitioners are implicated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not even an admissible evidence. It is submitted that the transaction of the amount of Rs.1,72,000/- was in the account of co-accused Paramjeet whereas, Rs.10,00,000/- in the account of co-accused, Vijay, however, co-accused Vijay has already been granted bail by the learned trial Court. It is submitted that the amount has already been

seized by the Bank and on superdari, given to the complainant. To buttress their arguments, it is contended that the petitioners are behind the bars from last more than 06 months and they have no criminal antecedents. It is submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners deserve to be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that though both the petitioners have no criminal antecedents, however, he has submitted that the bank accounts in question have been reported in 21 different cyber offence complaints throughout the country and have been used for committing cyber offence to the tune of Rs.2,63,00,000/-. He has submitted that petitioner-Mohit has lured his uncle Paramjeet Singh and made him open a current bank account in question by giving him Rs.2.5 lakhs and thereafter, the petitioner had taken the entire bank account kit and details from his uncle and supplied it to further other co-accused. Further, the said bank account was eventually used for commission of cyber offence throughout the country to the amount of Rs.78,24,260/-. He has submitted that petitioner-Abhishek Yadav in connivance with co-accused persons used to facilitate and utilize bank accounts for routing and siphoning off the defrauded amount. He has submitted that the petitioners has played an active role in the commission of offence and the allegations levelled against them are serious in nature. On instructions, he has submitted that out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far and the petitioners have no criminal antecedents.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the allegations against the petitioners are regarding the fraud on pretext of investment and total transaction runs in crores of rupees. Petitioners have been named on the basis of disclosure statement and they

are not the recipients of the defrauded amount as submitted by counsel for the petitioners. As submitted by counsel for the petitioner-Abhishek Yadav, the petitioner has returned the amount of Rs.10,00,000/- to the complainant which was freezed by his Bank. Custody certificates filed by the State shows that petitioner-Abhishek Yadav has undergone incarceration of 07 months and 13 days as on 18.05.2026 and petitioner-Mohit has undergone incarceration of about 7 months and 22 days as on 19.05.2026. It further reflect that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents. As submitted, out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present cases, this Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.05.2026 **(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**
m.sharma **JUDGE**

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