



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

(235)

**CRM-M-3380-2026(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION:11.05.2026**

Vikram

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Munish Kumar Garg, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.61 dated 08.09.2025, under Sections 318(8) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Kurukshetra.

2. As per the prosecution case, the role attributed to the present petitioner is that he lent his bank account to the co-accused for routing the alleged defrauded amount and, in lieu thereof, received commission of total amount of Rs.85,000/-. However, no specific allegation has been levelled against the petitioner regarding direct interaction with the complainant or participation in the act of putting the complainant under digital arrest.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is praying for grant of regular bail on the following aspects:-

- i. That the petitioner was added to the investigation solely on the basis of disclosure statement;
- ii. That the petitioner is in custody for the last seven months;
- iii. That the alleged offences are triable by Magistrate;



- iv. That the investigation has already been completed;
- v. That the petitioner is a first-time offender and is not involved in any other criminal activity; and
- vi. That the trial is likely to take considerable time and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars;

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, files custody certificate of the petitioner, same is taken on record. He opposes the present petition by submitting that the petitioner is involved in a cyber fraud racket and that the defrauded amount was transferred from his account to an account in CHINA. However, it is fairly admitted by learned State counsel that the petitioner is not involved in any criminal activity except the present case.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the view that concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure of punishment, as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides, and it is trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception. Accordingly, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner on the following aspects:

- i. That the petitioner is in custody for the last seven months;
- ii. That the offences alleged against the petitioner are triable by Magistrate;
- iii. That the petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case except the present one;

CRM-M-3380-2026(O&M)

3

iv. That the investigation has already been completed and the case is fixed for prosecution evidence;

v. That trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

7. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear that in the event the petitioner is found involved in any similar activity in future, the State shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted to him.

9. All pending misc. applications, if any, be also disposed of.

11.05.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No