



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

120

CRM-M No.59444 of 2025 (O&M)
Decided on: 27.02.2026

Karan Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Vimal Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.78 dated 14.06.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 61(2) [Sections 238(c) of BNS added later on] of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Cyber Crime, Sector-20, Panchkula.

2. Briefly stating the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'ASI Satish Kumar'. It was stated by the above named police officer that he had received a tip off from a reliable source that 'Karan Kumar' (petitioner herein) was involved in illegal activities and that he was opening bank accounts in the name of poor and labour class persons on the pretext of Government schemes, and that after opening of accounts, he is collecting the pass-books, cheque books ATM Cards and SIM Cards link with those



accounts, and thereafter he uses them for illegal/fraudulent transactions. It is the case of prosecution that in view of above mentioned information a raid was conducted and the petitioner was apprehended and from his possession 12 pass books and 18 ATM Cards were recovered.

3. It is case of the prosecution that pursuant to above mentioned recovery the requisite formalities with regard to seizure and sealing of recovered items, slapping of FIR and formal arrest of petitioner were performed, and further investigation taken up. According to prosecution in the accounts related to the pass books recovered from the possession of petitioner there were allegations of cyber fraud worth Rs.13.46 crores and qua above mentioned aspect 166 online cyber fraud complaints were registered in different states.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. A perusal of the record shows that following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision in the present petition:-

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of eight months;
- iii) that except the ATM Cards and pass-books nothing



incriminating has been recovered from the possession of petitioner and for being in possession of above mentioned pass-books no criminal act can be attributed to the petitioner;

- iv) that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v) that trial of this case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that it has been conceded by learned State counsel that on the instructions of SI Harjeet Singh, that with regard to 166 complaints which have been received online he does not have the details as to whether any FIR has been registered or not;
- vii) that the detention of petitioner in the judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate in the trial.

8. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another', (2018) 3 SCC 22, are relevant, wherein it has been observed that "a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found



guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case”.

9. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation’ (2022) 10 SCC 51 are also relevant in this case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that “the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications



will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice”.

10. Recently, in the case of ‘Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of Chhattisgarh’, 2025 SCC Online SC 322, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that “if an accused is to get a final verdict after incarceration of six to seven years in jail as an undertrial prisoner, then, definitely, it could be said that his right to have a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed”. It has also been observed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the abovementioned case that “delays are bad for the accused and extremely bad for the victims, for Indian society and for the credibility of our justice system, which is valued. Judges are the masters of their Courtrooms and the Criminal Procedure Code provides many tools for the Judges to use in order to ensure that cases proceed efficiently”.

11. To elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to an undertrial prisoner, as mandated by Hon’ble Apex court in ‘Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and another’ 2024 SCC Online SC 4354.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for the concession of bail,



and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

13. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court. However, the abovesaid benefit shall be subject to following conditions:-

- i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any other authority;
- ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial; and
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of trial Court.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

27.02.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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