IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

239

CRM-M No.13525 of 2025
Date of Decision: 15.05.2025

Manjeet Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

***

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
15	08.05.2024	Cyber Crime, Rewari, District Rewari	420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the complaint lodged by Manoj Sharma alleging that he had received a notification on his social media account for online trading. He had clicked a link sent to him and was added in two Whatsapp groups. There were several members in those group. As advised, he started watching the trading

activities as informed in that group. Then he was induced by two persons who introduced themselves online with the names of Alexis Gray and Joseph H.Davis, to start trading on the platform provided by them. They informed him about the process via making chats individually on his Whatsapp number. Several links were sent to him to install applications for trading which he had so installed. On being induced, he had invested an amount of Rs.13,34,500/- in various accounts the details of which were given to him. However, when he tried to withdraw the same, he was not permitted to do so and more amount of money was demanded from him. Having realized that he had been cheated, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The transactions of the bank accounts of the complainant were analyzed and the details of the beneficiary accounts were obtained. The details of the suspected account number were checked and it was revealed that the same was in the name of one Sun Shine Lamp Shade firm with the name of the proprietor as that of the present petitioner. The petitioner was found to be confined in jail in another case bearing FIR No.09 dated 08.03.2024 registered against him for commission of similar offence. His presence was secured by way of issuance of production warrants and he was associated with the investigation and was formally arrested. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. It was revealed that at the behest of co-accused Gaurav Singh and Monty, he had opened the aforementioned bank account by showing him proprietor of Sun

Shine Lamp Shade firm. He had given the ATM cards relating to the said bank account and other details to the co-accused on receipt of an amount of Rs.5000/- per month and this account was used for the purpose of committing cyber fraud. Investigation has since been completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. No recovery of any incriminating article has been effected from him. He has been connected on the basis of alleged transfer of sum of Rs.30,000/- in his bank account from the account of the complainant. Mere deposit of this amount does not establish his culpability. He was not the prime beneficiary. He is in custody since long. The trial would take considerable time. His involvement in another case is not a ground to deny benefit of bail to him. With these broad submissions, it is argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused is alleged to have opened bank account in the name of a firm by using fake documents and the said account is alleged to have been given by him to the co-accused and the same was used for the purpose of committing online fraud by duping the complainant and transferring money belonging to him in the said account and further transfer of the same to the different bank

accounts. The amount as deposited in the bank account operated by the petitioner might be small amount. However, the entire transaction shows active complicity of the petitioner in the subject crime. Crimes of this nature are on the rise and have become a growing menace in today's digital age. Cyber criminals are using sophisticated methods to target public persons and institutions. A stringent approach for deterring offender is required. The gamut of above discussed circumstances does not call for grant of benefit of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition does not deserve to be allowed and is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

15.05.2025
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No