

2026:PHHC:073330



CRM-M No.19775 of 2026

-1-

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

216

**CRM-M No.19775 of 2026
Date of decision : 11.5.2026
Date of uploading : 11.5.2026**

Vijay Singh**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Najar Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, 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 Grime, Gurugram, District Gurugram.
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused has cheated/defrauded the complainant to the tune of ₹15,24,90,017/- between 23.12.2024 to 12.4.2025, impersonating themselves as Schroders Customer Executive (a British Multinational Asset Management Company) associated with London Stock Exchange and made the complainant to download a cloned Schroders App for trading purposes in share market.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has urged that the petitioner



is in custody since 5.9.2025. Learned counsel has further urged that the petitioner has been implicated into the FIR in question primarily on the basis that his account is being used as a mule account. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is in custody for more than 7 months. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit of Amit Bhatia, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Cyber, Gurugram dated 28.4.2026, which is on record. Raising submissions in tandem with the said status report, 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 17.4.2026 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 5.9.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out; challan was prepared on 27.9.2025 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 at Bar 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



evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 17.4.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 7 months and 13 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in 01 more FIR(s) under Section 420 IPC. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. 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 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.

In addition to above conditions, the petitioner shall be required to either deposit cash surety or an FDR in the name of Court releasing him on bail to the tune of ₹ 1 lakh.

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.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

11.5.2026
Ashwani

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