



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-58247-2025
Decided on : 11.03.2026

Soyab . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Sandeep Kumar, P.S. Cyber Crime, Nuh.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Soyab, aged 20 years	100	17.06.2025	318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and 42(3)(E) of Telecommunication Act, 2023	Cyber Crime	Nuh

2. Allegation against the petitioner is that he had taken 30% commission from the alleged deal. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the said allegation is neither here nor there, as there is no evidence of any money having been credited into the bank account of the petitioner. It is further submitted that the name of the petitioner has been implicated in the present case only on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused.

Further submits that co-accused Manish and Sahil, in whose statements the name of the petitioner has surfaced, have already been granted the concession of bail. A copy of the order dated 18.09.2025 passed



in the case of co-accused Sahil, has been appended as Annexure P-2. Thus, learned counsel prays for concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is contended that the petitioner was actively involved in the alleged transaction and had taken 30% commission from the deal. Learned State counsel further submits that the investigation is still at a preliminary stage and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required for the purpose of unearthing the complete chain of events and identifying other persons involved in the commission of the offence.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused and that co-accused Manish and Sahil have already been granted the concession of bail.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is noticed that the allegation against the petitioner is that he had allegedly taken 30% commission from the deal in question. The plea raised on behalf of the petitioner is that there is no material on record to show that any amount has been credited into the bank account of the petitioner and that his name has surfaced in the present case only on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. It is further not disputed that the co-accused, namely Manish and Sahil, in whose statements the name of the petitioner has surfaced, have already been granted the concession of bail.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2)



Cr.P.C.).

7. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

8. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 11, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*