



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(225)

CRM-M-1307-2026(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION:12.05.2026

Sushil

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Jitender K. Sehrawat, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. AG, Haryana.
Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate, for complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. This is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS'), seeking **regular bail** in case bearing FIR No.122 dated 06.04.2025, under Sections 308(4), 316(2), 318(4) and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short – 'the BNS'), registered at Police Station Murthal, District Sonapat, Haryana.

2. Allegations against the petitioner are that he along with other co-accused induced the complainant's brother, Sita Ram, to travel to Cambodia on the false promise of providing him a job; that after reaching Cambodia, Sita Ram was illegally confined, physically assaulted, administered electric shocks and held hostage by company persons for ransom; that the victim allegedly disclosed through WhatsApp calls that the petitioner was the agent from Hisar, who had sent him to Cambodia and demanded huge amount to get him released; that upon inquiry, the complainant traced the role of present petitioner through co-accused and



thereafter approached the police apprehending danger to the life of his brother.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the following grounds;

- i. That the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case;
- ii. That the petitioner is in custody for the last more than nine months;
- iii. That investigation has been completed and challan stands presented;
- iv. That the other co-accused have been granted concession of regular bail by learned trial Court;
- v. that neither any amount has been received by the petitioner nor any recovery has been effected from him and
- vi. That there is no transaction of money in his account.

4. Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. AG, Haryana, appears on behalf of respondent no.1 / State and Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate, appears on behalf of complainant and files his *vakalatnama*. The same is taken on record. Learned counsel opposes the bail petition on the following grounds:

- i That the petitioner was an active and integral member of a well organized cyber fraud syndicate which is spread over across border and operating in coordination with associates based in India and Cambodia;
- ii That the said racket is involved in Cyber Crime and used to send a person as a security so that in the event of any cheating, the same can be detained there;
- iii That Rs.39,50,000/- has been withdrawn by the petitioner and other co-accused from Bandhan Bank, Hisar and due to that, victim was kept hostage in Combodia by co-accused and he was tortured and an extortion of Rs.42,00,000/-was demanded from his relatives and received, as per the statement of the complainant;



iv That the statement of the victim i.e Sita Ram is also recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C before the learned Magistrate concerned wherein he also named the present petitioner as an accused who played an active role in the commission of offence.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court finds no ground to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:

- i. That the name of the petitioner has been specifically mentioned by victim Sita Ram in his statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C wherein he has also disclosed the modus operandi of the accused persons;
- ii. That the allegations further indicate that substantial amounts were withdrawn from Bandhan Bank, Hisar, by the petitioner along with co-accused and the victim was kept hostage in Combodia by counter parts/co-accused and
- iii *Prima facie*, the allegations against the petitioner are serious and have transactional ramifications.

7. Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby **dismissed**.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.



CRM-M-1307-2026(O&M) 4

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

12.05.2026 (SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta JUDGE

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