



142

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

CRM-M No.40075 of 2025

Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

Himanshu Tapraniyam

..... Petitioner

Versus**State of Haryana**

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rajeev Lochan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.48, dated 24.06.2024, under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Sector Cyber Crime, District Sonipat. Further prayer has been made for granting interim bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the present petition.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Vishal Bhardhwaj, s/o Shri Parmeshwar Bhardhwaj. It was alleged that on 10.05.2024, a friend request was received on his facebook account, who invited the complainant to do Forex Trading on Telegram App. and



introduced himself to be the part of Multinational Company, i.e. Admiral Market Global Limited. The complainant was lured by way of promise to him to earn profit by depositing money and assured him that he would get twenty to thirty percent profit in a few days. Thus, the complainant invested a total amount of Rs.34,50,920/- in various accounts given by them from 12.05.2024 to 08.06.2024. It was further alleged that when the complainant tried to withdraw his money, the company refused and started asking for more money in the name of tax and bank charges. Thus, the complainant found that the website was fake and they had cheated the complainant for an amount of Rs.34,50,920/-. Thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the accused persons. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and, thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 22.08.2024. On completion of investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 28.05.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case, however, he has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He has submitted that the co-accused, namely, Aditya Bhadoria and his uncle, namely, Ranjit had misused the account of the petitioner and other co-accused, namely, Rakesh, Imran and Banti @ Bunty for committing cyber fraud and duped the money of the complainant. He has submitted that neither the petitioner has any active role in the alleged offence nor he has committed any fraud with the complainant. He has submitted that the co-accused, namely, Aditya Bhadoria and his uncle, namely, Ranjit targeted the petitioner as well as as other people, who all were in need and not financially capable to earn much and used their accounts in order to commit the offence of fraud with the complainant. He has further submitted that co-accused, namely, Imran Khan and Banti @ Bunty have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide separate orders dated 19.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-186-2025 & CRM-M-579-2025, respectively. He has submitted that co-accused, namely, Rakesh Kumar has also been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat vide order dated 06.06.2025 and case of the petitioner is on the same footing with the aforesaid co-accused. He has further submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 22.08.2024, however, there is no material progress in the trial. He has further submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has



never been involved in any other case. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioner has been duly established during the investigation. He has submitted that the allegations of cheating made against the petitioner are serious in nature. He has submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are that he has opened a fake bank account in SBI in the name of firm RS Dairy Product and gave all the details to co-accused, namely, Aditya Bhadoria and his father, Ranjit and on account of the same, he received an amount of Rs.25,000/- in return as commission. He has submitted that the total amount of Rs.9,65,000/- was deposited in the account of the petitioner and out of which, he has transferred an amount of Rs.5,60,000/- in the account of his mother and the amount of Rs.2,10,000/-, has been withdrawn by him. He has submitted that the petitioner has operated the bank account from 22.05.2024 to 15.06.2024 and during that period, there was a transaction of total amount of Rs.3,69,00,507/- in the said account. He has further submitted that the investigation is complete and the charges have been framed. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 07 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has further submitted that case of the petitioner is totally different from the co-accused, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Hon'ble Court as well as by the learned trial Court. He has further submitted that



the allegations against the petitioner have been specifically made and, thus, no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed. He has further submitted that when the petitioner received a call from Tamil Nadu Police regarding the cyber fraud of Rs.4,00,000/- in the account of the petitioner, then in order to escape from the police, he told them that his account got hacked. He has further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in 02 other cases of the similar nature. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that complicity of the petitioner has been prima facie established during the investigation. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner along with the co-accused had cheated the complainant by inducing him to invest in online trading. The petitioner opened a fake SBI account bearing No.42806121597 in the name of firm RS Dairy Product and thereafter gave all the details to the co-accused, namely, Aditya Bhadoria. In return, the petitioner received an amount of Rs.25,000/- as commission. Thereafter, total amount of Rs.9,65,000/- was received in the account of the petitioner, out of which, he transferred an amount of Rs.5,60,000/- in the account of his mother and an amount of Rs.2,10,000/- has been withdrawn by him through ATM. The petitioner operated the bank account from 22.05.2024 to 15.06.2024 and during that period, there was a transaction of total amount of Rs.3,69,00,507/- in the



said account. There is no parity in the case of the petitioner with that of the co-accused, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Hon’ble Court as well as by the learned trial Court. The allegations made against the petitioner are serious in nature and are distinguishable to that of the co-accused, who were already on bail. The investigation is complete and the charges have already been framed. Out of total 07 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. The petitioner is also involved in 02 other cases of the similar nature and he is not on bail in both the cases.

7. Keeping in view the above said position, this Court does not find any ground to release the petitioner on bail at this stage. Hence, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

24.02.2026

rittu

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE