

CRM-M-24316-2026

2026:PHHC:069889



233
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-24316-2026

Manjeet Singh @ Aryan
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
...Respondent

Date of Decision: May 06, 2026
Date of Uploading: May 06, 2026

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Rakesh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Cr. P.C., 1973/ Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioners, in case bearing FIR No.19 dated 16.09.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 238(C), 318(4), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023, at Cyber Police Station, Mohindergarh.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the complainant, namely, Udai Singh, filed a complaint on 16.09.2024 alleging that an amount of Rs.25,00,000/- had been fraudulently withdrawn from his bank account No.360009900000377 through online cheating during the period from 09.08.2024 to 10.08.2024. The complainant stated that he maintained the said joint account along with his wife, Sumitra Yadav, at PNB Branch, New Mandi, Narnaul. He further alleged that on 31.08.2024, he received a telephonic call from an official of the bank informing him to deposit interest towards a loan

CRM-M-24316-2026

allegedly withdrawn from the aforesaid account. Expressing ignorance about any such loan transaction, the complainant checked the bank account statement and discovered that on 09.08.2024, three online transactions of Rs.5,00,000/- each had been made, amounting to Rs.15,00,000/-, and on 10.08.2024, two further online transactions of Rs.5,00,000/- each had been effected. Consequently, a total sum of Rs.25,00,000/- had been debited from his account through unauthorized online transactions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner was arrested on 28.03.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has urged that there is no incriminating evidence available against the petitioner. Learned counsel has argued that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further argued that, in any case, investigation *qua* the FIR in question is complete and challan stands filed. Learned counsel has urged that the petitioner is a youngman aged 22 years with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioners are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioners do not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel also seeks to place on record the custody certificates dated 04.05.2026, in the Court today, which are 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 28.03.2025, whereinafter, the investigation was carried out and the challan *qua* petitioner has been presented on 26.05.2025. Total 9 cited prosecution witnesses have been cited, but none

CRM-M-24316-2026

has been examined till date. It is, thus, indubitable that culmination of trial will take long time. The rival contentions raised at Bar; including the contention as to whether the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question; shall essentially 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 absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. As per custody certificates dated 04.05.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioners have already suffered incarceration for a period of 01 years, 01 month and 05 days, & are not shown to be involved in any other FIR(s).

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioners 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, if not required in any other case, 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 cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and

CRM-M-24316-2026

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 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.

11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

May 06, 2026
mahavir
Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No