



230

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-9439-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:10.07.2025

GOPAL SONI

...PETITIONER

VS.

UT OF CHANDIGARH

...RESPONDENT

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Lokesh Vohra, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Bansal, Public Prosecutor, U.T., Chandigarh.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

**CRM-12555-2025**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed  
subject to just all exceptions.

Annexures P-9 to P-11 are taken on record.

**Main Case**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483  
BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.59 dated  
17.06.2024, registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC,  
Police Station Cyber Crime Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the  
present case was registered on the basis of a complaint moved by Krishan Lal



Gupta son of Dhani Ram Gupta. Even the allegations were levelled against some other persons and the petitioner was not named initially. He further contends that it has been alleged that a sum of Rs.4,40,000/- was received in the account of the petitioner. In fact the petitioner himself is a victim and had already made a complaint on 17.06.2024 against the accused to Rajasthan police. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested on 06.11.2024 and is in custody for the last about 08 months. During the course of trial, the prosecution has examined 03 witnesses out of total 10 witnesses so far and the trial may not conclude early. He further contends that the petitioner is a first offender and was never involved in any other case.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about 08 months. Moreover, the prosecution is yet to lead evidence regarding the involvement of the petitioner in the crime and he cannot be detained as an under trial prisoner for a longer period. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his



furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

**10.07.2025**  
*vipin*

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

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