



CRM-M-32686-2025 and  
CRM-M-33703-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-32686-2025

Vipul

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

208-2

CRM-M-33703-2025

Manshi @ Urvashi

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

**Decided on :18.07.2025**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Bijender Dhankar, Advocate  
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-32686-2025).

Mr. Deepak Vashishth, Advocate  
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-33703-2025).

Mr. Ashok S. Chaudhary, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. This order shall dispose of the aforementioned cases as they arise out of the same FIR.

2. Present petitions have been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 180 dated 13.03.2025, under Sections 318(4), 319 of the BNS, and Sections 66D, 43 of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, and Section 75 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Kundli, District Sonapat.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, in their respective petitions, submit that even if the allegations are taken to be true and correct on their face value, no offence is made out against the petitioners. In fact, there is no witness with the prosecution to prove the charges. The allegations that the petitioners defrauded residents of the USA, by operating a call centre without having any license, would not constitute an offence in itself unless, someone files a complaint with the police alleging that they were defrauded. There is not a single witness or complainant who has ever appeared before the agency to substantiate the allegations, which in fact appears to be concocted by the prosecution agency. It is further submitted that even if the call centre is found to be in operation but without a license, that situation may amount to a violation of rules or laws requiring a license to run such a centre. However, the accused cannot be prosecuted for defrauding people solely on that ground. Counsel further submits that the investigation has already been completed and the final report has been submitted to the Court concerned. The process of recording statements is yet to begin, and even the charges are yet to be framed. Thus, he prays for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has filed a status report in CRM-M-33703-2025, by way of an affidavit of Vipin Kumar Ahlawat, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Rai, Sonipat, on behalf of the respondent-State, in Court today. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place with the paper-book.



The Investigating Officer, who is also present before this Court, states that the offence was registered on the basis of secret information and a raid conducted by the police. It is also pointed out that at the time of conducting the raid, seven laptops and mobile phones were recovered from the premises where the call centre was being operated without a license, and the same have been sent to Ditech Lab, Panchkula, for further examination.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon noticing that the status report dated 17.07.2025 filed by the respondent-State does not contain any clarification on the issue raised by the petitioners, and considering the clarification attempted to be provided by the State, this Court is of the view that the allegations levelled by the prosecution are yet to be proved. The Trial Court shall also take into account the contentions raised by the petitioners at the time of framing of charges, before proceeding further. If necessary, expert opinion on the subject involved may also be sought through the prosecution agency. As informed, the investigation is already complete, and the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate. The petitioners have been in custody since 13.03.2025. In the considered opinion of this Court, any further incarceration would not serve any meaningful purpose for the prosecution. Accordingly, this Court finds merit in the petitioners prayer for the grant of regular bail.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their



**CRM-M-32686-2025 and  
CRM-M-33703-2025**

**4**

furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/  
Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned,  
if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.
8. Petition stands disposed of.
9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**

**18.07.2025**

*Rashmi*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*