



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

236

**CRM-M-4397-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 26.05.2025**

ROOP SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present : Mr. Udit Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG Haryana

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)**

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 CrPC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Sections</b>	<b>Police Station</b>
06	31.07.2023	406, 420 and 34 IPC	Cyber Crime, Sirsa, Haryana

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 has no concern whatsoever with the allegations levelled in the FIR. He further contends that even after the arrest of the petitioner, recovery of only ₹2000/- has been effected from him and he is not



having any criminal antecedents. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 04.11.2024 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 status report filed by the State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime and deceived the complainant by fraudulently receiving money from him. He submits that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail and prays for dismissal of the petitioner.

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 instant FIR was registered on receipt of a complaint from Amandeep stating that on the basis of a WhatsApp message received by him, he was assured that in case he makes an investment and performs a particular task, he will get sufficient profit. On the basis thereof, the complainant deposited some amount and got the profit as well, but later the investment made by him was not returned and in this manner got defrauded. Consequently, many persons including the petitioner were arrested on 04.11.2024 and ₹2000/- was recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 04.11.2024 and after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court, triable by the Court of Magistrate, wherein the prosecution has cited 19 witnesses, however, none has 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.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**26.05.2025**

*S.Sharma(syr)*

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