

2026:PHHC:026806



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

116-2

CRM-M-49100-2025
Date of Decision: 19.02.2026

AVNEESH JAIN

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.0029 dated 18.05.2024, under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC (Section 201 IPC added later on) registered at P.S. Cyber Crime Sonipat, District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with other co-accused has duped the complainant by alluring her to invest huge amount (Rs.81 Lakh) in some companies which were stated to be registered in the SEBI, however, these were found to be fake companies.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as no amount has been received by him in his account. It is stated that complainant has been examined as PW-1 in which she has exonerated the petitioner from the charges as imposed against him as she had never met the petitioner. He further submits that challan has been presented and charges have been framed. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than one and a half year as undertrial, therefore, petitioner be released on bail pending trial.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the

petitioner on the ground that the role attributed to the petitioner is specific and that he has actively participated in the commission of the offence.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than one and a half year, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

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 bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 19, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No