

2025:PHHC:126237



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND  
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

218

**CRM-M-44615-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 12.09.2025**

**Mohd. Salman @ Mohammad Salman**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya  
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNSS'*), is for grant of anticipatory  
bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 86 dated 22.06.2024, registered under Sections  
420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Cyber Crime, Panipat,  
District Panipat.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a  
complaint lodged by complainant Apoorva Singh alleging that she had moved  
several applications for doing 'work from home' jobs. On 29.05.2024, she  
received a call and offer was made to her to do data entry by sitting at home  
and that she would be getting salary to the tune of Rs.15,000/- to Rs. 20,000/-  
per month. She gave her consent to the caller and he created an ID in her  
favour. During the course of conversation, her ID had been temporarily  
blocked. Then she received call from a different number and the caller told her

2025:PHHC:126237



to deposit a sum of Rs.4,000/- for operation of the ID created in her favour. Subsequently, she was induced to part with a sum of Rs.5,71,925/- by getting the same transferred in different online transactions. Having realized that she had been cheated, she prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Evidence was collected in scientific manner and it was revealed that money from the bank account of the complainant was transferred in a bank account operating in the name of accused Deepak Kumar and the mobile phone, which was connected with that account, was in the name of accused Rahul Gupta. During the course of investigation, offences under Sections 467, 468, 471 read with Section 120-B of IPC were added. Accused Ravi Kumar Dangi, Ashok Kumar, Sachin Kumar and Abu Sufiyan were apprehended and arrested. On interrogation, accused Abu Sufiyan suffered disclosure statement that the petitioner had introduced him with co-accused Rahul @ Raghav, who had offered to give him 3% commission if money from fraudulent transactions was deposited in his bank account and was given to him (Rahul). He further disclosed that he had agreed to the same and money by way of fraudulent transactions was being credited in his bank account, which was given by him and the petitioner to Rahul @ Raghav. On his disclosure, the present petitioner was nominated as accused. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Panipat but the same had been dismissed, vide order dated 08.08.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement made by

2025:PHHC:126237



the co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He is neither beneficiary to any transaction nor his bank account had ever been used in the entire transaction. The ingredients for commission of subject offences have not been made out against him. Co-accused Rahul, against whom there are graver allegations, has been extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. Even otherwise, a compromise has been effected between the parties. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of pre-arrest bail as his custodial interrogation is required for conducting proper investigation in the matter. Wrongful loss to the tune of Rs.5,71,925/- has been caused to the complainant. The investigating agency has collected Whatsapp conversation having taken place between co-accused Abu Sufiyan and the petitioner, which shows his active complicity in the crime. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also perused the material placed on record.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have conspired with the co-accused, in pursuance of which, a bank account was got opened in the name of co-accused Abu Sufiyan and the same was used for the purpose of transfer of money,

2025:PHHC:126237



which was extracted from the complainant by duping her in the name of providing her job at home. Accused Rahul has been extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. However, the evidence collected so far by the investigating agency shows active participation of the petitioner in the subject crime and hence his case cannot be stated to be at parity with the co-accused. 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 pre-arrest bail to the petitioner which even otherwise is an extra ordinary remedy to be exercised in exceptional circumstances which do not exist in this case. The well settled proposition of law is that while considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are to be exercised in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. More so, custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 482 of BNSS. Many useful information can be disinterred during custodial interrogation. Keeping in view the discussion as made above, I am of the considered opinion that no extraordinary or sparing circumstance entitling the petitioner to seek concession of pre-arrest bail has been made out. Accordingly, finding no merit, the petition is dismissed.

2025:PHHC:126237



8. 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.

12.09.2025

*Waseem Ansari*

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned*  
*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*