



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

243+244

CRM-M-25288-2025

Date of Decision: 23.07.2025

(1) Vikash

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM-M-25860-2025

(2) Sikander

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Amit Sharma (Kanav), Advocate &
Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-25288-2025.

Mr. Rohit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-25860-2025.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off two bail petitions, i.e., CRM-M-25288-2025 titled as “**Vikash Vs. State of Haryana**” and CRM-M-25860-2025 titled as “**Sikander Vs. State of Haryana**”, whereby, the petitioner(s) have applied for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No.101 dated 12.11.2024 under Sections 318(4) of BNS, 66D of IT Act 2008 & 35/36 of the Haryana Pariwar



Pehchan Act, 2021 (Haryana Act No.20 of 2021) registered at Police Station Cyber, Jhajjar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Vikash (petitioner in CRM-M-25288-2025) contends that the petitioner was working as Bid Panchayat Level Operator in CRID and was not named in the FIR. The complainant had alleged that in order to avail the benefits under different Government schemes, no Pariwar Pehchan Patras were being made by accepting the applications by hacking or illegally using the District Manager's Portal by some unknown persons. During the course of investigation, the police had wrongly arrayed the petitioner as accused in the present case without any evidence against him. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was initially arrested on 29.11.2024 and is in custody for the last 08 months. Even after completion of investigation, the challan has been presented against him and his further custody will not serve any useful purpose.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sikander (petitioner in CRM-M-25860-2025) submits that the petitioner was working as a Manager of DCRIM and has been falsely involved in the present case. Even he was arrested by the police on 24.01.2025 and challan has been presented against him. He further submits that no witness has been examined so far and the custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.



4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner(s) and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

6. In the present case, both the petitioner(s) are stated to be in custody for the last more than 06 months. Even the recoveries have already been effected from both the petitioner(s) and challan against them has been presented before the competent Court. The prosecution is yet to lead evidence to prove the involvement of the petitioner(s) in the crime. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner(s) will not serve any useful purpose.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed. The petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail pending trial on their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

23.07.2025

vipin

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No