



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

CRM-M-72439-2025

Date of decision : 05.05.2026

Aman @ Aman Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Prashant Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.236 dated 21.11.2024, under Sections 318(4) of BNS (Section 66(D) of Information and Technology Act, 2000 (amended 2008) was added lateron), registered at Police Station Cyber Manesar, District Gurugram.

2. As per the facts of the case, the present FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Lt. Col. Dalel Singh (Retd.). It was alleged that the complainant was contacted on Telegram by an ID @ Laksuzo named given Laksmi A M 18th September 2024. It was alleged that on 25.09.2024, they started discussing about the trade marketing and complainant was convinced. It was alleged that thus, the complainant was duped of Rs. 59,60,585/- by way of cyber fraud. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he has been arrayed in the present case.

Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 10.02.2025. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, praying for



grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 02.12.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-34733-2025, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn on 26.11.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the allegations against the petitioner is that there is a transaction of Rs. 12,10,585/- in the account of the petitioner. He submits that co-accused, namely, Vikas Duhan, to whom the account has been sold has already been granted bail by learned trial Court on 17.11.2025. To buttress his arguments, he has contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case earlier. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 01 year. He submits that investigation in the present case is complete and charges have also been framed. He submits that except the present petitioner, rest all the accused are on bail. He thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is the main accused. He submits that there is a transaction of Rs.12,10,585/- in the account of the petitioner, which proves his complicity. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far. He affirms the fact that except the present petitioner, rest all the accused are

on bail. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case was arrested on 10.02.2025. Admittedly, the co-accused to whom the petitioner has sold his bank account, is already on bail. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 25 days as on 04.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined.

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

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his 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.

05.05.2026
ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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