



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

141

CRM-M-66889-2025
Date of decision: 10.03.2026

RISHABH JHAPetitioner
VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 81 dated 30.05.2025, registered under Section(s) 318(4) (Section 61(2) added later on) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Cyber Crime, Rewari, Haryana.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Jitendra Kumar son of Shatrughan Singh, which reads thus:-

“I Jitendra Kumar S/o Shatrughan Singh, R/O, Village Sheetalpur Andawa, Police Station Kokhraj, District Kaushambi, Uttar Pradesh, currently residing on rent at Bawal, Rewari. I work in Wanfeng Aluminum Wheel India Pvd. Ltd. Company. On 22/05/25, I received a message on WhatsApp at my mobile number 9277380318 that your brother met with an

accident. When I called my brother Birendra Kumar, his phone was switched off and I asked him to send a photo of my brother, he said he is in the hospital. First send me money so that I can get him admitted in the hospital. After that I sent him Rs. 80,000 on his phone, after that he did not pick up my call, after which I came to know that some unknown person has defrauded me. Legal action should be taken against him. Applicant Jitendra Kumar S/O Shatrughan Singh R/O Village Sheetalpur Andawa Police Station Kokhraj District Kaushambi Uttar Pradesh PH. 9695071075. Today a complaint number 31305250034648 was received at the police station on which the complainant was informed to come to the police station with the relevant bank records, the complainant Jitendra Kumar S/O Shatrughan Singh currently tenant of Bawal Rewari came to the police station and submitted a written application, on the basis of the application it was found that a serious crime under section 318 (4) BNS was made out, case number 81 dated 30.05.2025 under section 318 (4) BNS was registered."

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely roped in as an accused on the disclosure statement of co-accused Anil Sahu, in whose account Rs. 20,000/- was received. Counsel contends that the case was initially registered against certain unknown persons and the allegation against the petitioner is that he provided the bank account details of the co-accused Anil Sahu to another co-accused Zubaid Khan and Zubaid Khan further gave the same to the main accused Sameer Dangi. He contends that the petitioner was falsely implicated by Anil Sahu on account of dispute between the parties and that such disclosure in any case is otherwise also not admissible in evidence. He submits that the bail application of the petitioner was dismissed solely on the ground that he belongs to Madhya Pradesh and that it would be difficult to

secure his presence and to conclude the evidence in the present case.

4. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner is in custody since 12.08.2025 and that the charge in the present case was framed on 23.01.2026. There are 06 witnesses to be examined in the present case and 01 witness already stands examined. The case is now fixed for recording of prosecution evidence on 19.03.2026. The prosecution shall conclude its evidence within a period of three months of the date next fixed before the trial Court for recording of the prosecution evidence. He further contends that there has been a direct transaction of Rs. 20,000/- in the Indian Overseas Bank account belonging to Anil Sahu and that the account of said Anil Sahu had been purchased by the petitioner herein and he further sold the same to accused Zubaid Khan. He contends that the case of the petitioner would be at variance with the co-accused Zubaid Khan to whom concession of regular bail has been granted in as much as the case of the petitioner would be at distinction since the petitioner had provided the bank account details of Anil Sahu to Zubaid Khan.

5. He contends that in any case, as the prosecution has undertaken to conclude its evidence within a period of three months and that there is no apprehension of the trial being unnecessarily delayed or prosecution evidence not being concluded within the statutory time frame. There is no infeasible right to seek bail that has accrued in favour of the petitioner.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties. Taking into consideration the fact that the trial Court has to take steps for an expeditious conclusion of the prosecution evidence and 01 witness out of 06 has been already examined and the case has been fixed for 19.03.2026 for recording of the prosecution evidence, coupled with the

fact that the prosecution undertakes to complete its remaining prosecution evidence within a period of three months from the date next fixed before the trial Court, I deem it appropriate to dismiss the present petition at this stage.

7. The respondent-State shall, however, remain bound to conclude its evidence within the time period as aforesaid.

MARCH 10, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No