



CRM-M-15234-2026 (O&M)

1

2026:PHHC:060002

216

2026:PHHC:060002



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

**CRM-M-15234-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 21.04.2026**

TASLIM @ TASLEEM

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Mr. Gopal Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Chetan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J (ORAL)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 208 dated 17.09.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 420, 419, 467, 468, 471 and 34 IPC) and Section 42(3) of the E-Telecommunication Act, at Police Station Cyber Crime, Nuh, District Nuh, Haryana.

2. The present FIR was registered on the basis of secret information received by the police on 17.09.2025 regarding the involvement of co-accused Aamir in cyber fraud activities using fake mobile SIM cards. Acting upon the said information, the police party conducted a raid and apprehended the co-accused Aamir, from whose possession a mobile phone



and multiple SIM cards were recovered. During investigation, it was found that certain cyber fraud complaints registered in the State of Chhattisgarh were linked with the recovered SIM card. It was further revealed that illegal transactions had been carried out through bank accounts linked to the said SIM, including an account allegedly in the name of the present petitioner. On the basis of these allegations, the present FIR was registered and investigation was initiated.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and his name has surfaced only on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Aamir. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner and no material has been placed on record to show his involvement in the alleged cyber fraud. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not the operator of the alleged SIM cards and at best, certain transactions have been reflected in his bank account without any knowledge or active participation on his part. It is further argued that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 07 months, the investigation stands completed and the challan has already been presented.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed a reply dated 18.04.2026, which is taken on record. She has opposed the bail application on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner was an active participant in the cyber fraud racket and acted in connivance with co-accused Aamir and others. It is further contended that the petitioner facilitated the commission of the offence by allowing his bank account maintained with PNB to be used for receiving and routing the cheated amounts obtained from the victims



through fraudulent means. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, without commenting upon the merits of the case, it is apparent that the challan in the present case has already been presented and charges have been framed, however, none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about one year and seven months. The conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

6. It is also a matter of record that co-accused persons, including the main accused Aamir, have already been granted the concession of bail. Thus, the case of the present petitioner stands on parity with the said co-accused. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner is likely to abscond or tamper with the prosecution evidence.

7. Keeping in view the period of custody, stage of trial, principle of parity and the fact that further incarceration would serve no useful purpose, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

9. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

21.04.2026

Poonam Negi

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No