



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

**CRM-M No.14667 of 2026
Date of decision:-06.04.2026**

JITENDER ALIAS JITU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Vijay Deep, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mohan Sheoran, Advocate for
Mr. Abhimanu Jangra, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J.

1. This is a petition under Section 483 BNSS for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.294 dated 16.10.2025, under Sections 318(4) & 238 BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 420 & 201 IPC), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, NIT, District Faridabad.

2. The present case arises out of Complaint No. 31309250072354 dated 26.09.2025 lodged by the complainant Naresh Kumar, resident of Jawahar Colony, Faridabad. The complainant stated that on 24.09.2025 at about 6:00 PM, he received a call from an unknown person who introduced himself as Akhil, a brick-kiln worker, and offered to supply bricks at a cheaper rate. On the inducement of the caller, the complainant, on 25.09.2025, transferred an amount of Rs.19,250/- through



his son Mohit Singh to the mobile number provided by the caller. However, the promised goods were not delivered, and the complainant realized that he had been cheated. Consequently, the FIR was registered. The applicant was arrested on 31.10.2025 and has been in judicial custody since then, leading to the filing of the present bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and is not named in the FIR or in the complaint. It is contended that the entire case of the prosecution rests upon circumstantial evidence, particularly the alleged recovery of a mobile phone and IMEI report, and no specific role or overt act has been attributed to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 31.10.2025 and has undergone incarceration of more than four months; investigation stands completed and challan has already been presented, therefore no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in further custody. It is also argued that the petitioner is a poor labourer, having no criminal antecedents, and the offences alleged are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate with maximum punishment up to seven years. The petitioner undertakes to join trial, not to tamper with evidence, and not to influence any witness.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the bail application and submitted that the petitioner had cheated the complainant by introducing himself with a fake name and inducing him to transfer money on the pretext of supplying bricks at cheaper rates. It is further contended that the mobile phone used in the commission of offence has been recovered at the



instance of the petitioner and, as per IMEI report, the same was used at the relevant time. It is also argued that if released on bail, the petitioner may influence or threaten the complainant and other material witnesses. It has further been pointed out that the first bail application of the petitioner was dismissed and the second bail application was also dismissed primarily on the ground that a female member of the petitioner's family had allegedly threatened the complainant outside the Court premises to settle the matter, and therefore, the present petition deserves dismissal.

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

6. The petitioner is in custody since 31.10.2025 and has undergone incarceration of approximately five months. The investigation is complete and challan has already been presented. The amount allegedly involved in the present case is only Rs.19,250/-, and the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate with maximum punishment up to seven years.

7. So far as the allegation regarding threat to the complainant is concerned, except for the said allegation attributed to a female member of the petitioner's family, there is nothing substantial on record to substantiate the same. Even otherwise, the petitioner has undertaken that he shall not, in any manner, coerce, pressurize, or threaten the complainant or any prosecution witness and shall abide by all the conditions imposed by this Court.

8. Considering the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the nature of allegations, the stage of the trial, and without



commenting on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that further incarceration of the petitioner is not warranted.

9. Accordingly, the present bail application is allowed, and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, and subject to the condition that he shall not influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

06.04.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No