



123 (2 cases)

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

1. CRM-M-61130-2025

Neeraj KumarPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

2. CRM-M-61815-2025

Rakesh KumarPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

Date of decision : 27.02.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Robin Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioners (in both petitions).

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Govind Arora, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of
abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present
second petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.37
dated 07.06.2025, under Section 318(4) of BNS, registered at Police Station
Cyber Crime Sirsa, District Sirsa.



3. As per the facts of the present case, the present FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Surjit Singh. It was alleged that on 26.05.2025, the complainant viewed an advertisement on facebook page whereby he was allured to get pension of Rs.1 crore by paying a sum of Rs.21,000/- however, he did not respond. Thereafter, on 28.05.2025, the complainant received calls from various numbers and being allured from the call received, he duly transferred a total amount of Rs.6,23,280/- and thus, the fraud was committed upon the complainant. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioners surfaced and thus, they were arrayed as an accused in the present case and subsequently, arrested on 05.07.2025. On completion of investigation, challan presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioners approached the learned Sessions Judge, Sirsa, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same were declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide orders dated 01.08.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioners earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-42500-2025 and CRM-M-42511-2025, respectively, however, same were dismissed as not pressed by this Court vide orders dated 11.08.2025. Hence, the petitioners are before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present second petitions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioners were not even named in the FIR, nor any specific role was alleged against them, however, during



presumptions and assumptions. He submits that the account in which the transaction were found to be have been alleged is owned by Lovepreet Singh. It is submitted that primarily the allegations were against Lovepreet Singh, however, he has not been arrayed as an accused in the present FIR. It is further submitted that the complainant in the present case has already been examined, who has not supported the case of the prosecution and thus, has been declared hostile. It is submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents and they are behind bars from last more than 07 months. It is submitted that investigation is already completed and charges are also framed. It is thus, submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has affirmed the fact that the complainant had not levelled any allegations against the petitioners and thus, he concedes that he has not supported the case of the prosecution qua the petitioners.

6. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners and submits that complicity of the petitioners surfaced during investigation. He submits that the account in which the transactions were found to have been made, belongs to one Lovepreet Singh, who has been made a prosecution witness before the trial Court. He submits that the same account was used by the petitioners and thus, their complicity is evident. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses, have been examined including the complainant who had not supported the case of the prosecution. He has produced the custody certificates of the petitioners on record.

On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it



is deciphered that the petitioners were arrayed as an accused during investigation and subsequently, were arrested on 05.07.2025. The allegations against the petitioners are to the effect that they used the account which belongs to one Lovepreet Singh. However, as submitted before this Court, Lovepreet Singh has been made a prosecution witness. As per custody certificate, petitioners have suffered an incarceration of 07 months and 22 days as on 27.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents. The complainant has already been examined, who had not supported the case of the prosecution.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.02.2026
ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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