



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1838/2026**

ASIF ALIAS ASIF MD Applicant

Through: **Mr. Shakil Akhtar, Adv.**

versus

**STATE OF NCT DELHI THROUGH SHO PS CYBER POLICE
STATION SOUTH DELHI** Respondent

Through: **Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for the
State with Mr. Aditya Vikram
Singh, Adv. alongwith SI Ashish
Kumar, PS Cyber South**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

13.07.2026

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 482* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.73/2025 dated 19.11.2025 registered at PS.: Cyber Police Station South, Saket Delhi under *Sections 112(2)/317(2)/61(2)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (**BNS**).
2. Status Report handed over by the learned APP is taken on record.
3. The FIR herein was registered on the basis of secret inputs and technical analysis of NCRP/I4C data wherein it was revealed that an Indian Bank account in the name of co-accused Wasi Ali was being used as a mule account for receiving and routing proceeds of cyber frauds. During verification, co-accused Wasi Ali allegedly disclosed that he had handed over his bank account, ATM card, passbook and SIM card to co-



accused Shahnawaz @ Govinda for a consideration of Rs.5,000/-. Further, co-accused Shahnawaz disclosed that he had supplied the credentials of the said account and instruments to the present applicant, who is alleged to be one of the handlers of the organised cyber-fraud syndicate.

4. In this factual backdrop, this Court has heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP, as also gone through the documents on record.

5. As borne out, though the applicant is not named in the FIR and his involvement only surfaced during the course of investigation by way of disclosure statement of co-accused Shahnawaz, however, since the allegations pertain to offences involving operation of an organised cyber-fraud syndicate which (may) be having a far wide spread over network what it seems on the face of it, and the same also has wide ramifications in the society, *prima facie* in the opinion of this Court, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

6. In fact, as held in ***Serious Fraud Investigation Office (supra), P. Chidambaram vs. Directorate of Enforcement: (2019) 9 SCC 24*** and ***Srikant Upadhyay & Ors. vs. State of Bihar & Anr.: (2024) SCC OnLine SC 282*** it is trite law that since matters involving cyber fraud, economic offences/ crimes, especially those entailing large-scale fraud and misuse of public funds, constitute a different class of cases, the discretion of granting anticipatory bail ought to be exercised sparingly as such offences demand serious considerations since it affects the very economic fabric of the society.

7. Although, learned counsel for applicant seeks to take benefit of already having been granted regular bail *vide* order dated 05.12.2025 in



another FIR No.178/2025 also pending against the applicant, however, considering that the same was pertaining to grant of regular bail whereas the applicant is seeking anticipatory bail herein, as held in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia vs. State of Punjab: (1980) 2 SCC 565*** and ***Devinder Kumar Bansal vs. State of Punjab: 2025 SCC OnLine SC 488***, since the threshold and parameters for both are different, the said contention is negated. Moreover, grant of regular bail to the applicant in an FIR does not *ipso facto* itself entitle him to grant of anticipatory bail in another FIR.

8. Thus, taking note of the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the applicant, and the material collected during the course of investigation, particularly the allegation that the applicant acted as one of the handlers of an organised cyber-fraud syndicate, and recovery of digital devices, ATM cards, SIM cards and other incriminating articles are yet to be effected, as well as the money trail and involvement of the remaining members of the syndicate are yet to be unearthed, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the applicant may be required, no case for grant of anticipatory bail, at this stage, is made out.

9. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed.

10. Needless to say, expression of view(s) on the merits, if any, are solely for the purposes of adjudication of the present application and shall have no bearing on the overall case/ trial involved.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

JULY 13, 2026/rr