



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

264

CRM-M-21231-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.05.2026

Sachin Kumar

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Nafeesh Ahmad Khan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Onkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG Haryana.

Mr. Sudhir, Advocate and
Complainant -Ms. Pritha Chakraborty in person,
both through V.C.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.247 dated 08.07.2025, registered under Section(s) 204, 318(4), 319, 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Cyber Crime Police Station Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. The present FIR was registered on the complaint/statement of Pritha Chakraborty daughter of late Pinaki Chakraborty on the allegations that on 08.05.2025, she received a call where the caller identified himself as calling on behalf of Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI). She was informed that an FIR had been lodged against her at Colaba Police Station and thereafter, the call was transferred to a person who identified himself as an IPS Officer, Vikrant Singh, who manipulated and coerced the

complainant into following his instructions under the pretext of legal and surveillance protocols. The complainant was later contacted by a different person purportedly from E.D., who pressurized the complainant into transferring significant amount of money to a so called security supervision with the false promise of refund of entire amount within three days. On receipt of the complaint from the complainant, the present FIR was registered and the beneficiary accounts were frozen. It was further revealed that a sum of Rs.10 lakhs was transferred in current bank account bearing No.005061900010645 being maintained at Yes Bank in the name of M/s Logitec Water Pvt. Ltd. The account holders- Dharmender and Ram Kishan who were already in custody in another FIR registered in Chandigarh were joined in investigation. The said accused persons were taken in custody in the present FIR as well and they disclosed that they had transferred the account kit and other details to the petitioner herein on the basis whereof the petitioner arrested was on 06.10.2025.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner had purchased the bank account kit from the account holders for a sum of Rs.1 lakh and thereafter he had forwarded the same at Telegram ID to receive crypto currency and used the same to make payment to the account holders. He contends that be that as it may, the petitioner has resolved his dispute with the complainant in the present case and that the amount which was transferred to the aforesaid account has been returned by him. It is further argued that the petitioner has been in custody since 06.10.2025 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 07 months. He submits that only 09 out of the total 22 prosecution witnesses have been

examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. He submits that the offences in question are triable by the Court of a Magistrate and the investigation qua the petitioner is complete and his further custodial detention is unwarranted. It is further submitted that the charge has not been framed so far and thus, the conclusion of trial will take a long time.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. He, however, contends that on similar allegations, another case bearing FIR No.115 dated 20.10.2024 under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 61(2), 238(C) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Cyber Crime, Bhiwani also stands registered against the petitioner. The petitioner has not been released on bail in the said FIR.

5. Counsel for the complainant does not dispute the rest of the averments and conveys that they would have no objection, in the event, the concession of regular bail is granted to the petitioner in the present case at this stage.

6. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial as well as the fact that the complainant has no objection to the grant of bail to the petitioner and the case being triable by the Court of a Magistrate and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate

concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

10. The order is however without prejudice to the respective claim of any of the parties and shall have no bearing on respective roles of other accused/individuals.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

25.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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