

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

234

CRM-M-27243-2025

Date of decision: 30.07.2025

Manish Sahu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*


**H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.84 dated 22.10.2024, under Sections 318(4), 316(2) BNS, registered at P.S. Cyber Jhajjar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with his co-accused have duped the complainant of Rs.21,08,109/- on account of cyber fraud. However, Rs.1,56,715/- was directly put into the account of the present petitioner which has been returned to the complainant who has sworn an affidavit before the trial Court on that account.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not involved in the alleged crime at any stage and his account has wrongly been involved for the transfer of the alleged amount. He further submits that the charges have been framed and the trial is yet to commence. The petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 10 days as under trial, therefore, he be released on bail pending trial.

4. Notice of motion.



5. Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 10 days as under trial.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that charges have been framed and trial is yet to commence, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**30.07.2025**

anil

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