



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:046378

2026:PHHC:046378



(142)

CRM-M-67915-2025

Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

Mohd. Sohel @ Aasu @ Mohammad Soel

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.**

Present:- Ms. Sonal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner  
(through V.C.).

Mr. Rakesh Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**H.S. GREWAL.J (Oral)**

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.241/2025 dated 01.07.2025 under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 61(2), 204 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Cyber East, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 01.07.2025, complainant moved a complaint in the police station stating therein that on 18.06.2025 she received a call on her landline number from a person claiming to be from Airtel, who stated that her mobile connection would be blocked due to calls being received from the CBI. Subsequently she received calls from a person who introduced himself as Inspector Pradeep Sawant from Mumbai Police. She was told by the aforementioned person that four accounts in different banks were opened in her name and that she transferred Rs.38 crores from these bank accounts to J&K Bank for drug trafficking and money laundering. Thereafter, complainant transferred different sums of



money totalling to Rs.27,00,000/-. Thereafter, she came to know that fraud was committed with her. The complainant transferred Rs.8,79,000/- on 20.06.2025 and Rs.5,30,000/- from her Punjab & Sind Bank account through RTGS mode. A request was thus, made to take legal action against the culprits.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations against the petitioner are false and concocted and the petitioner has not committed any offence. It is contended that when the cyber fraud had taken place, the present petitioner was lodged in jail in case FIR No.37/2025 dated 12.06.2025 and was brought on production warrants and subsequently falsely implicated in the present case. Therefore, the role attributed to the petitioner in the present case was negligible. It is further contended that the petitioner is a young boy of 20 years of age and has already undergone a custody period of more than 06 months in the present case. The trial will take a long time to conclude. He thus prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State Counsel vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence. The petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate of the petitioner has been produced by the State Counsel, as per which petitioner has undergone actual custody period of 06 months and 29 days.

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



6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 25.08.2025 coupled with the fact that the trial of the case is likely take a long time to conclude as none of the witnesses has been examined so far as well as the fact that nothing has been recovered from the petitioner in the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

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 bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**24.03.2026**  
lucky

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable:        | Yes/No |