IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3383 OF 2025

Ankur P. Jain …Applicant
V/s.
The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ...Respondents.

………….
Mr. Rahul Moghe i/b Adv. Kalyani Rathod and Ms Aniruddha Koldge for the Applicant.
Mrs. Mankuwar Deshmukh, PP a/w. Ms Anagha Deshmukh for the Respondent/State.
Dy.S.P. Pradip T. and PI Jaywant Jadhav, Maharashtra Cyber, Mumbai are present.
Michael J. Mascarenhas, Respondent No.2 is present in the Court.
………….

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 16.12.2025.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail.

2. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No. 42 of 2025 registered at Nodal Cyber Police Station, Cyber Unit Maharashtra State for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 126(2), 316(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 66(C) & 66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000.

3. On 19th August 2024, the first informant received a call from the co-accused informing him that he is being held under digital

arrest due to certain illegal activities observed in his bank account. It is alleged that under the guise of digital arrest the present applicant and other co-accused extorted an amount of Rs.58,13,50,000/- from the first informant. During the course of investigation, the co-accused in the present crime namely Sunny Lodha, Sunny Jain and Mukesh Singhvi came to be arrested and they disclosed the involvement of the present applicant in the crime in question.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant and the learned Public Prosecutor for the respondent / State.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is a Chartered Accountant by profession. It is submitted that the applicant has nothing to do with the alleged crime. It is submitted that the applicant is not the beneficiary of the alleged extorted amount. It is submitted that the applicant is ready and willing to cooperate in the investigation.

6. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor for the respondent/State submits that the applicant was operating the accounts in which extorted amount was transferred. It is submitted that there are certain financial transactions between the applicant and co-accused. In support of the said submission, learned Public Prosecutor has drawn my attention to the statements of co-accused Sunny Lodha, Sunny Jain and Mukesh Singhvi so also the statements of bank accounts.

7. I have perused the statements of the co-accused. It appears that the present applicant has provided certain bank accounts to co-accused in which extorted amount was deposited. There are also certain financial transactions between the applicant and co-accused. To unearth the conspiracy, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary. Considering the nature of crime, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the Application is rejected

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]