

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 342 OF 2025

Vishnu N Narayanappa	
S/o N Narayanappa	...Applicant
Versus	
The State Of Maharashtra	...Respondent

Mr. Laxman R. Shahapur i/b. Rohit Mishra, Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. Rutuja A. Ambekar, APP for the State.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATED : 14 FEBRUARY 2025

PC.:

1. The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with C.R. No. 0792 of 2024, dated 06 October 2024, registered with Pune Cyber Police Station, District Pune, under Sections 316 (5), 319 (2), 318 (4) and 3 (5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. It is the case of the present Applicant that he has no role to play and in present transaction, he was merely involved in the selling of virtual currency. One Mr. Aniruddha Dongra (Accused No.1) paid him money in exchange for virtual currency. The virtual

currency was not returned to Aniruddha Dongra but he was given to one Varun Kumar Guddely. Therefore the Applicant should not be held for guilty for offences lodged in F.I.R. and his custody is not necessary.

3. The learned APP submits that the Applicant is not coming forward with clean hands and is not disclosing the true nature of the transactions. There are 15 complaints filed against the Applicant across the country. Despite being issued a notice under Section 35(3) of the BNS Act, 2023, the Applicant did not respond to it. Therefore, since he is not cooperating with the police, the custody of the Applicant would be necessary. The Sessions Court by detailed order is rejected.

4. It has been submitted that there are around 15 complaints filed against the present Applicant across the country. In the present proceedings, there are six accused, out of six accused, two namely, Aniruddha Dongra and Varun Kumar Guddely have already been arrested. There was no explanation from the counsel for the Applicant as to why the money received from Aniruddha Dongra was not returned to him in the form of virtual currency, but was returned to Mr. Varun Kumar Guddely. Specific details of

the 15 other Complaints pending against the Applicant are not provided. Furthermore, as the investigation is still ongoing, the present Applicant has not cooperated, despite the police issuing a notice dated 17 January 2025 under Section 35 (3) of the BNS Act, 2023. The Applicant neither complied with the notice by attending police station nor sent a reply to the said notice. It is evident that Applicant is not cooperating with the Investigating Officer.

5. It appears that that the Applicant is having three bank accounts for conducting his business, and the details of these bank accounts also needs to be provided to the police. It is contentions of the Applicant that he has no role to play in the present crime, as he has never met the Informant/Complaint. According to the prosecution, money was transferred from the account of the Informant to the account of the Accused (Aniruddha Dongra), and the fact that Aniruddha Dongra subsequently transferred that money to the present Applicant is acknowledged. However, the Applicant claims to have returned the entire amount in the form of virtual currency. Therefore, the Applicant cannot be termed as Accused in the present proceedings. Hence, the Applicant has

expressed his readiness to cooperate to the police, and as such, his the custody would not be necessary.

6. I do not find any merits in the present Anticipatory Bail Application. Hence, **the present Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.**

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)