



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214-1

CRM-M-28155-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.05.2026

Khushveer Batra @ Khushu Batra

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

214-2

CRM-M-28160-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.05.2026

Sahil Shishodia

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

214-3

CRM-M-28241-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.05.2026

Sunny @ Sunny Verma

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Lovish Arora, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG Haryana.

Mr. Saksham Khunger, Advocate for respondent(s) No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. All these three petitions, filed by three accused/petitioners, for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.12 dated 28.01.2026, registered under Section(s) 308(2), 316(2), 318(4), 238(c), 61(2) [(Sections 238(c), 61(2) added later on)] of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station

214-1	CRM-M-28155-2026 (O&M)
214-2	CRM-M-28160-2026 (O&M)
214-3	CRM-M-28241-2026 (O&M)

Cyber Crime, District Panchkula, are being decided by this common order.

For the facility of reference, the facts are, however, being taken from **CRM-M-28155-2026** titled as '**Khushveer Batra @ Khushu Batra Vs. State of Haryana and another.**

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the present FIR was registered on the statement/complaint of respondent No.2-Rupali daughter of Bhim Singh, who claimed that she had been duped for a sum of Rs.13-14 lakhs on the pretext of superstitious practices and allured into believing certain dogmas. It is further alleged by the complainant that regular payments were made to different accounts as conveyed to her by the petitioners herein and on the basis of said complaint, the present FIR was registered, whereupon the petitioners were arrested. He contends that the petitioners are young boys each of 20 years of age with clean antecedents. He contends that the petitioners have been in custody since March-2026 and all the offences are triable by the Court of a Magistrate. He submits that the matter has already been compromised with the complainant-respondent No.2 and appended the copy of mutual settlement dated 04.05.2026 executed between the parties, wherein, it has been specifically stated that complainant-respondent No.2 has no further grievance against the petitioners. It is contended that the petitioners shall continue to appear before the trial Court and shall not delay the proceedings in any manner whatsoever.

3. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the clean antecedents of the petitioners. The custody undergone by the petitioners is also not disputed.

214-1 CRM-M-28155-2026 (O&M)
 214-2 CRM-M-28160-2026 (O&M)
 214-3 CRM-M-28241-2026 (O&M)

4. Separate power of attorney(s) have been filed on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant in all the three cases and the same are taken on record. Counsel admits the factum of compromise effected between the parties and submits that the grievance of respondent No.2-complainant stands redressed at this stage and he would have no objection, in case, the concession of regular bail is granted to the petitioners.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the fact, that the dispute arising out of a financial transaction has been amicably resolved and the complaint has no subsisting grievance and that the investigation in the present case is complete and final report already stands filed, I deem it fit to allow the instant petitions.

6. Accordingly, all these three petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

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

8. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

22.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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