



213+214

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision:08.08.2025

(i) CRM-M-27557-2025

Irfan Khan @ Irafan Khan ...Petitioner

vs.

U.T.Chandigarh ...Respondent

(ii) CRM-24595-2025 in/and
CRM-M-29084-2025

Dev Singh @ Dev Chugh ...Petitioner

vs.

State of U.T.Chandigarh ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Afzal Hussain, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-27557-2025.

Mr. Abhishek Joon, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-29084-2025.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor, U.T., Chandigarh.

N.S.Shekhawat J.(oral)

CRM-24595-2025

1. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner wishes to withdraw the instant application.

2. Dismissed as withdrawn.

Main cases

1. This order shall dispose off above-said two petitions i.e. CRM-M-27557-2025, titled as Irfan Khan @ Irafan Khan Vs. U.T.Chandigarh



and CRM-M-29084-2025 titled as Dev Singh @ Dev Chugh Vs. State of U.T.Chandigarh, whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No.107 dated 27.10.2024 registered under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, at Police Station Cyber Crime, Chandigarh.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Pooja Verma D/o Ram Avadh Verma and the same has been reproduced below:-

“To, The SHO, Cyber Crime Police Station, Sector 17, Chandigarh Respected Sir, I wish to bring to your notice that on 17.08.2024 (Saturday) at 8:00 PM, I received a call from phone numbers 8199948429 and 9528477629. The caller verified about her to be the daughter of Ram Avadh. I said yes, she then stated that my father (Ram Avadh) had given her my contact, as he owed her 13,000. I asked her to scan the details, but she said her scanner was not working. She first sent me a text message requesting 10,000, and instead of 3,000 more, she mistakenly wrote 30,000 and said it was an error. She kept insisting that she needed to go to the hospital urgently and pleaded for the money. Mistaking her for a genuine customer, I did not pay close attention to the message and transferred 2,000 followed by 25,000 via Google Pay. Despite that, she kept calling and messaging me repeatedly, asking for more money claiming it was urgent. I request legal action to be taken against her and for my money to be recovered. Thank you, Sd. Pooja Verma D/O Ram Avadh Verma.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner appearing on behalf of Irfan Khan @ Irafan Khan, petitioner in (CRM-M-27557-2025) submits that the FIR was initially registered against unknown persons relating to certain fraudulent



transactions. However, during the course of investigation, the police alleged that the petitioner was also involved, however, no incriminating evidence could be collected against him. Learned counsel further contends that as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner had procured amounts from Dev Singh @ Dev Chugh, co-accused and no other role has been assigned to him. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 03.02.2025 and is in custody for the last about more than 6 months. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented against him and the trial has to formal begun against him.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Dev Singh @ Dev Chugh, the petitioner in CRM-M-29084-2025 has raised similar submissions before this Court. He also submits that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the basis of the alleged disclosure statement made by Sukha Ram and other accused. Even the petitioner was not beneficiary of any of the amount, which was duped from the complainant and there is no evidence collected against the petitioner. The petitioner is arrested on 29.01.2025 and is in custody for the last more than 6 months.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that serious allegations have been leveled against the present petitioners and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that there is no other case registered against both the petitioners.

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

7. In the present case, the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 6 months and challan has already been presented against both of them.



Moreover, both the petitioners were not involved in any other criminal activity, in past. The prosecution is yet to lead evidence to connect the petitioners with the crime.

8. At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

08.08.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No