IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

109

CRM-M No.61082 of 2024
Date of Decision: 10.12.2025

Vrushab Rajesh Sharma ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Amit Parashar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Birender Bikram Attrey, Addl. AG, 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
33	26.11.2023	Cyber Crime, Police Station, Kurukshetra, District Kurukshetra	420 and 120-B of IPC (467, 468 and 471 of IPC added later on)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Jadgeep Singh who was made a victim of cyber crime and was induced to part with a sum approximately Rs.75,94,631/- on the allurement that on investing the aforementioned

amount would fetch double profits. On realizing that a calculated fraud had been played upon him, the complainant prayed for taking action. After conducting preliminary inquiry, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that an amount of Rs.98,000/- was got deposited from the complainant on 04.10.2023 in an account opened in the name of one Tingle Tarier Logistics Pvt. Ltd. Gurugram which was operated by the present petitioner. It was also revealed that approximately a sum of Rs.2,52,80,737/- was deposited in this very account and at various intervals Rs.2,50,23,033/- had been withdrawn. The inquiry also revealed that as many as 58 complaints had been filed with regard to this account and three FIRs had been registered as against the present petitioner. He was nominated as an accused. He was found to be in custody in some other case. His presence was secured by issuance of production warrants and he was joined into investigation on 16.04.2024. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime along with co-accused for earning money by committing online fraud. He disclosed that on asking of co-accused Raman to provide some bank accounts in lieu of a sum of Rs.3 lakhs, he had opened an account in the name of Tingle Tarier Logistics Pvt. Ltd. and had sold the same to the co-accused and received a sum of Rs.2,70,000/- in lieu thereof. He also disclosed that he had opened 20 bank accounts in various names on the basis of fake Aadhar Card and by changing his addresses and even by forming other companies. Investigation qua the petitioner now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for a period of over 1 year, 7 months and 18 days.. The co-accused Sagar has been extended benefit of bail. He has been extended benefit of bail in three cases as registered against him. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. He is not required for further investigation as the same stands concluded. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by his further incarceration. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Today, custody certificate by the District Jail, Gautam Budh Nagar has also been filed showing that presently, the petitioner is in custody in several cases of similar nature in different parts of the country.

5. Learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He has been involved in several other cases of similar nature and 58 complaints have been filed qua the account which was opened and operated by him. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Huge amount of money was transferred in the account operated by him. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance of that conspiracy, cyber crime was committed with the complainant by inducing him to part with a huge amount of money by transferring it to several accounts causing wrongful loss to him. One of such accounts was operated by the petitioner. Apart from the complainant's money, other transactions of huge amount of money are alleged to have taken place in that very account. Not even this, the petitioner is alleged to have opened several other bank accounts to defraud the public persons by depriving them of their money. 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.

8. 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

10.12.2025
manju

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