



134

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

**CRM-M No.50604 of 2025
Date of Decision: 24.03.2026**

Ranjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.25, dated 07.05.2025, under Sections 61, 340, 338, 336(3), 318(4) of BNS (Section 308(5), 319 BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime Sonipat, District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Rambhagat. It was alleged that the complainant was working as an Accountant in Gopal Builders Company. It was alleged that on 02.02.2025, the complainant received a *whatsapp* message and he introduced himself as Triveni Prasad & Company. He told the complainant that they can provide him the pipe. The complainant, on 05.02.2025, deposited an



amount of Rs.6,00,000/- in the account of Triveni Prasad & company through RTGS and on 06.02.2025, a fake proforma invoice was received by Triveni prasad & Company on the complainant's mobile number through *whatsapp* and told that the goods have been prepared. It was alleged that on 12.02.2025, further amount of Rs.6,00,000/-was deposited by the complainant in the HDFC bank account of Triveni Prasad & company. Then, they sent the details of vehicle No.MH30AB4635 and driver's name as Zahir. Thereafter on 13.02.2025, the complainant again deposited an amount of Rs.6,44,617/- in the HDFC bank account, however, the goods were not received. After few days, complainant tried to contact them, however, they did not pick up the phone and then, switched off the same. The complainant realized that he has been cheated and cyber fraud has been committed for a total amount of Rs.18,44,617/-. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner, namely, Ranjeet Singh, surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 29.08.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, however, he was implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Keshav, which is not even an admissible evidence. He has submitted that there is no direct allegation against the petitioner to show his involvement in the alleged incident, since he did not receive any amount from the complainant. He has submitted that the allegations of cheating the complainant are against the co-accused, namely, Manoj Kumar Gupta. He has further submitted that co-accused, namely, Manoj Kumar Gupta is the main accused, who has already been granted the concession of bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat vide order dated 13.11.2025. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 20.05.2025, however, there is no material progress in the trial. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Status report dated 17.10.2025 by way of an affidavit of Rajdeep Singh, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Kharkhoda, District Sonapat on behalf of the respondent-State has already been filed by the learned State counsel in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established during the



investigation. He has submitted that the petitioner is a key participant in a serious organized cyber fraud wherein he actively facilitated fraudulent transactions by providing bank accounts. He has endorsed the fact that co-accused, namely, Manoj Kumar Gupta, has already been granted the concession of bail by the learned trial Court. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 20.05.2025. The petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. The allegations of cyber fraud are against the co-accused and not against the petitioner. As submitted before this Court that co-accused, Manoj Kumar Gupta, is the main accused, who has already been granted the concession of bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 13.11.2025. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 10 months and 04 days as on 23.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the



sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

24.03.2026

rittu

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No