

2026:PHHC:091003



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

250

CRM-M No.33119 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 06.07.2026

Rajuddin

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Ms. Mandavi Pandey, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the second petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.14 dated 10.07.2024 registered under Sections 61, 319 and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNS") at Police Station Cyber Police Station, Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh. The previous petitions filed by him as well as two co-accused Namely, Akshay Guru and Mahinder had been dismissed by this Court vide a common order dated 03.11.2025 by making the following observations:-

"9. The petitioners, in connivance with each other and

2026:PHHC:091003



with other co-accused, are alleged to have cheated the complainant and caused him wrongful loss to the tune of Rs.72,64,266/-. The aforesaid accounts were found to be operative in the name of the firms, which were owned by the petitioners. The prosecution agency has collected evidence that an amount of Rs.3,20,000/- was transferred in the bank account of Pragati Enterprises owned by petitioner Akshay Guru, whereas an amount of Rs.2,40,000/- was found to be transferred in the bank account of New Year Multitrade, which is jointly owned by petitioners Rajuddin and Mahinder. Bank transactions of crores of rupees related to cyber fraud have been shown to be done in these bank accounts. Several other complaints are also shown to be pending inquiry qua these accounts. The allegations against the petitioners are quite serious in nature. Simply because of the fact that investigation has been completed, the petitioners do not deserve to be released on bail. Needless to say that the crimes of this nature are on the rise and have become a growing menace in today's digital age. The fraudsters are adopting this type of method to grab money of innocent persons by alluring them and committing cyber frauds. Cyber crimes are increasing day-by-day and by alluring the innocent persons, accused who are having knowledge of the cyber technology are committing frauds and cheating the public. As per settled law, there can be no leniency while dealing with bail application of cyber thugs in the matters of cyber crime. Cyber criminals must be dealt with stern hands. It is well settled law that in cases involving economic offences of such nature, bail cannot be granted as a matter of routine. Such offences cause a serious threat to the financial and moral fabric of the society. Keeping in view the

2026:PHHC:091003



discussion as made above, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners do not deserve to be released on bail, at this stage. Accordingly, the present petitions are dismissed.”

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that after the dismissal of his previous petition, a period of more than eight months has elapsed. However, there is no much progress in the trial. Each day spent by him in custody has furnished a new ground afresh to him to seek concession of bail. Even otherwise, he has been falsely implicated. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, thus, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana has advance notice of the petition and while placing on record custody certificate has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner as in connivance with the co-accused, the victim complainant had been duped of a sum of Rs.72,64,266/-. The trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Such like cases are on the rise. There is no substantial change in the circumstances. It is, therefore, argued that the petition is not maintainable.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

2026:PHHC:091003



6. The petitioner was one of the active participant in the commission of the subject offences as an amount of Rs.2,40,000/- out of the amount received from the bank account of the complainant was transferred in his account which had been withdrawn. Qua this very account, as well as 46 complaints are found to be pending and as per the respondent-State, several victims have been cheated on the basis of those transactions of a total amount of Rs.20,75,26,292/-. The allegations against the petitioner are specific and supported by prosecution. His active and conscious participation in the commission of the subject offences stands prima facie established from the record. The offence of cheating allegedly committed by the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is not an isolated act but part of an organized cyber crime wherein providing banking channels forms a crucial link in execution of the crime. Cyber crimes are steadily increasing and have a deep-rooted impact on society, targeting unsuspecting citizens and eroding public confidence in digital platforms. Such offences are serious economic crimes, affecting not only the victim but the financial system at large and, therefore, require a strict approach at the stage of bail. The previous petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed by passing a detailed order. There has been no substantial change in the circumstances warranting exercise of discretion by this Court for grant of bail to the petitioner. As such, the petition cannot be stated to be maintainable even

2026:PHHC:091003



otherwise keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the manner in which the offences were committed, the part played by the petitioner and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail, at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

06.07.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No