



CRM-M-20688-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

261

**CRM-M-20688-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 23.04.2026**

PRABHAY SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Ms. Vatsal Raj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.396 dated 07.09.2025 under Sections 318(4) of BNS (Section 111(3) of BNS added later on) registered at Police Station Shivaji Colony, Rohtak.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the present case has been registered on the basis of a complaint filed by Parmod Kumar wherein he alleged that on 25.08.2025, his wife Kusumlata received a call from an unknown mobile number regarding an EXIDE LIC account. During the conversation, his wife provided the complainant's mobile number to the caller. Thereafter, on the same day, the complainant received a call and he was informed that his wife Kusumlata had opened an EXIDE LIC account and an amount of Rs. 5,87,622/- was to be refunded to them by the company and for the said purpose, processing fees would have to be



paid, failing which the amount would be sent back to the Government. On this, the complainant transferred an amount of Rs. 24,900/- on 25.08.2025 to bank account No. as provided by the caller and subsequently, he transferred another amount of Rs. 64,600/- on 29.08.2025. However, after making the said payments, the complainant did not receive any further response from the caller and thereafter realized that he had been a victim of cyber fraud.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely involved in this case and there is not an iota of evidence to connect the present petitioner with the alleged evidence; the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 04 months; investigation has been completed and challan has been filed before the trial Court; the case of the prosecution is solely based on documentary evidence and there is no apprehension that he may tamper with the evidence if released on bail; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and as such, prayed for concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State, and by way of filing of custody certificate dated 22.04.2026, opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner and submitted that the present petitioner alongwith co-accused is involved in cyber crime and duped the complainant on the pretext of being an agent of LIC (Life Insurance Corporation). He is also involved in 02 more cases.



However, the same is controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner is involved in one more and he is on bail in that case, however, in another case, the petitioner was interrogated and was later on, released.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and the supporting evidence regarding role of the present petitioner in commission of alleged offence; the amount involved in the present case is below Rs.1,00,000/-; investigation is complete & challan stands presented; the present petitioner is in custody for last more than 04 months; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

23.04.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO