



321

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

**CRM-M No.17749 of 2026
Date of Decision: 09.04.2026
Date of Uploading: 09.04.2026**

Saurav Duggal

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Sanjay Kaushal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arjun Shukla, Advocate,
Mr. Abhimanyu Kaushal Advocate,
Mr. Rishab Dhiman, Advocate and
Mr. Charanjiv Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J.(Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (in correspondence under Section 439
Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR
No.10 Dated 11.08.2025 under sections 318(4), 319, 238(b), 336(3), 338,
340, 61(2) and 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [in
correspondence under Sections 420, 416, 201, 468, 467, 470 and 120(B)
IPC], registered at Police Nodal Cyber Crime, Panchkula.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of "Dhruv Gupta", hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was stated by the complainant that on 20.06.2025 he had received a message on Facebook messenger from the id named 'Anchal Rao @ Ammu' and when he responded to the above-mentioned message, the lady on the other side introduced herself as a Fashion Designer and thereafter she started chatting with the complainant on WhatsApp and during above mentioned conversation she prompted the complainant to invest in cryptocurrency. As per complainant, he was allured by the lucrative offer of high return and thus, he invested ₹6,50,000/- but later on he found that his account on the platform, which was told to him by the above said caller, had been frozen and thus, he was duped of the above mentioned money.

3. Learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 26.12.2025. Learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has further submitted the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has further submitted that there is no direct/tangible evidence available against the petitioner, so as to affix him with the culpability. Learned Senior counsel has further argued that a somewhat similarly placed co-accused, namely, Yashbir Singh Sandhu has been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-7096-2026 (Annexure P-2). Learned Senior counsel has further submitted that another co-accused, namely, Nitish Gudwani has also been granted regular bail by

this Court vide order dated 20.03.2026 passed in CRM-M No.12856 of 2026 (Annexure P-4). Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 07.04.2026 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 26.12.2025 whereafter investigation was carried out and Challan qua the petitioner was filed on 25.03.2026. Total 11 prosecution witnesses have been cited by the prosecution out of which none has been examined till date. It is not in dispute that the conclusion of trial will take long time. The rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties; as to the whether the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR, shall be gone into 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 rights of either of the parties. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the remaining prosecution evidence.

7. As per the custody certificate dated 07.04.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 03 months and 11 days & is shown to be involved in one more case/FIR.

However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in CRM-M No.38822-2022 titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

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 trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/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 cellphone 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/Illaqa 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 trial Court/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.

April 09, 2026
Yag Dutt

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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