



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

225

CRM-M-69121-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 17.02.2026

Anoop

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Hritik Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asst. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail, which is third petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.179 dated 24.12.2024 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4) (420 IPC), 319(2) (419 IPC), 61(2) (120-B of IPC), 241 (204 of IPC) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 66-C and 66-D of Information Technology Act, Police Station Cyber Crime, District Kurukshetra.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Ranjeet Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by above-named complainant that he was subjected to digital arrest and thus, duped for a sum of Rs.10,10,000/-. In his abovementioned statement the manner in which he was digitally arrested was narrated in



detail by the complainant and he requested for taking action against the culprits.

3. It the case of the prosecution that on the basis of abovementioned statement formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer collected the evidence with regard to transfer of money, and also the call details with regard to conversation between the complainant and the accused, responsible for digital arrest. According to prosecution, on the basis of abovementioned evidence the account wherein a part of the proceed of crime was transferred was tracked and it was found that the abovesaid account belonged to Vijender who was duly arrested and on interrogation he disclosed that the petitioner was also involved with him in the commission of above mentioned offence, and that money to the main accused, namely Jahar Roy and another accused involved in this case, namely Vijender @ Sindhu, was transferred by the petitioner by using his mobile phone.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Ms. Deepali Verma, Asst. A.G. Haryana appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State Counsel has orally opposed the present petition.



6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is innocent having no nexus whatsoever with the commission of crime and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner there is no legally admissible evidence against the petitioner and the prosecution case is entirely banking upon the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, namely Vijender, which was recorded in police custody. It has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that neither any money was transferred into the account of the petitioner nor the petitioner is the beneficiary of proceeds of crime and that he is already facing protracted incarceration for being in custody for a period of ten months.

8. The learned State Counsel has contended that there is ample evidence with regard to involvement of petitioner in the commission of crime, and that the mobile of petitioner was examined, for investigating his connection in the commission of crime with Vijender, in whose account money was ultimately transferred. It has also been argued that the petitioner does not have clean antecedents, as he has already been booked for similar offences in two other cases also. According to learned State Counsel, the petitioner is directly involved in the commission of crime and, therefore, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. The record has been perused carefully.



10. A perusal of record shows that second petition for bail filed by the petitioner was recently dismissed on merits on 30.09.2025, and from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, barely a period of four months and twenty five days has passed and the abovementioned period, in view of gravity of offence, cannot be treated to be a long period of incarceration justifying the filing of third bail petition.

11. Even the time gap between the second petition and the present petition is not large enough to draw an inference that there is delay in trial, and therefore, on account of prolonged incarceration also, the petitioner is not entitled to maintain this petition for bail.

12. As a sequel to abovementioned observations, it is hereby held that at this stage, the present petition for bail filed by the petitioner is not maintainable and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby ***dismissed***, accordingly.

13. However, it is clarified that the abovementioned observations shall not have any bearing upon the merits of the case.

14. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

17.02.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No