



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

245

**CRM-M-9309-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 28.05.2025**

VED

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Sanawar Ali, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G. Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
88	30.06.2024	420, 201 and 120-B IPC	Cyber Crime NIT, District Faridabad

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and as per the allegations, the petitioner provided his account to be misused by co-accused Sanjay and Parveen, for which he got ₹25,000/- as commission. He submits that the aforesaid co-accused have already been granted the concession of



bail. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 13.08.2024 and after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time. Thus, prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the reply filed by the State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner is holder of the beneficiary account, in which the amount of ₹2,49,000/- of the complainant was credited. He has, however, not disputed the fact that co-accused Sanjay and Parveen have already been granted the concession of bail.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Megha Aggarwal alleging therein that she had been defrauded on the pretext of earning good income from part time job. During the course of investigation, the petitioner was apprehended by the Police, as the account in which the complainant had transferred the money was in the name of the petitioner. As per the allegations, the petitioner had provided the details of the said bank account of co-accused, and had received ₹25,000/- as commission. The said co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail. The petitioner is in custody since 13.08.2024 and after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court, triable by the Court of Magistrate, wherein the prosecution has cited 12 witnesses, however, none has been examined till date. The criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, could only



be determined after the conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time. In the circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

6. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

28.05.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No