



IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH

106+203-1

CRM-M-14207-2025

JONY

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

A N D

106+203-2

CRM-M-17320-2025
Date of Decision: 16.01.2026

SONAM

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Pratham Sethi and Ms. Surekha, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-14207-2025.

Mr. Deepak Kohli, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-17320-2025.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-43911-2025 in 17320-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

The document Annexure P-4 is ordered to be taken on record subject to all just exceptions. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place of the paper book.

MAIN CASES

Both these petitions are being decided by a common order since they arise out of same FIR.

These petitions have been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.044 dated 22.11.2024 under Sections 25(1) B (a), 29-B and 30 of Arms Act, 1959, Section 23 of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 and Sections 61, 316(2), 318(3), 336(3), 338, 340 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 66C and 66D of IT Act registered at Police Station Nodal Cyber Crime, District Panchkula.

2. The allegations against the petitioners are that they had been running an unlawful and illegal policy/scheme and they got huge investments from the general public, thereby committing an offence under the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 and other relevant sections as mentioned above.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case by way of misuse of process of law. All allegations against the petitioners are false and baseless. They further submit that the petitioners have already undergone a custody of more than 01 year and 01 month, and the trial of the case might take a long time to conclude since the challan has been presented before the concerned Court and the charges against the petitioners are yet to be framed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that there is an active role of the petitioners in the commission of the offence in question. He further submits that six more FIRs have been registered against the petitioners in the State of Bihar. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificates filed by the State Counsel are taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioners have already undergone a period of more than 01 year and 01 month. However, learned State Counsel does not dispute the fact that the Bihar Police has not got the custody of the petitioners till date.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 01 year and 01 month and the trial against the petitioner might take a long time to conclude since the same is yet to commence, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners deserve the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioners are found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of their bail.
10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

JANUARY 15, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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