

2026:PHHC:044202



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

127

CRM-M-69236-2025
Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

MOHSIN

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Nissim Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.49 dated 23.07.2025 under Section 318(4) of the BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Kurukshetra, District Kurukshetra.

2. The allegations against the petitioner is that he induced the complainant to invest in a trading account as well as some other companies and in this way he defrauded the complainant of lacs of rupees. It is further alleged that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused used the account of co-accused Mohd. Adnaan for cyber fraud and an amount of Rs.2,67,82,671/- has been withdrawn out of the proceeds of cyber fraud.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter has been compromised between the petitioner and the complainant by way of an amicable settlement and the complainant has no objection in case the petitioner is granted regular bail. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last 07 months and 07 days. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. He further contends that the trial of the case is yet to commence and as such, the same will take a long time to conclude. He thus prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State Counsel vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence. He further submits that cyber offences are on the rise nowadays and as such, no leniency should be afforded to the petitioner. The petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate produced by the State Counsel is taken on record.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Souhard S. Hooda, Advocate has appeared and filed his power of attorney on behalf of the complainant and admitted the factum of compromise arrived at between the petitioner and the complainant.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 07 months and 07 days coupled with the fact that the trial of the case is yet to commence and is likely take a long time to conclude as well as the compromise arrived at between the parties, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

MARCH 20, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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