



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

217

CRM-M-11934-2026

Date of decision : 04.05.2026

Date of uploading : 04.05.2026

Lokesh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Isha Khanna, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.189 dated 28.5.2025 under Sections 318(4), 319, 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Cyber East, Gurugram, District Gurugram.
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused committed online fraud with the complainant by impersonating using WhatsApp group Rechak (the brand name of a global financial institution and deceptive tech infrastructure) and fraudulently caused loss to the complainant the tune of ₹15,24,90,017/-.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 06.06.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question.



Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has been primarily implicated into the FIR in question on account of disclosure statement which is not tenable in law. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is a man with clean antecedents and has also suffered incarceration for more than 10 months. Learned counsel has further argued that similarly placed co-accused, namely Rahul Shankhla alias Rahul Pratap Singh (in CRM-M-67634-2025), Dinesh Kumar (in CRM-M-8268-2026), and Nitin Kumar Sen (in CRM-M-19065-2026), have been afforded the concession of regular bail by this Court. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 30.04.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 06.06.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out; challan was prepared on 28.7.2025 and subsequently filed. Total 25 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood



of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 30.04.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 10 months and 26 days & is not shown to be involved in any other case.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of
opinion on the merits of the case.

04.05.2026
jatin

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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