



CRM-M-65383-2025

-1-

**(213) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-65383-2025

Date of decision : 11.12.2025

VINOD KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Apporv Garg, AAG, Haryana

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.100, dated 21.08.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 75, 66, 66-C, 66-D of IT Act and Section 42(3) of Telecommunications Act, 2023 registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Panchkula, District Panchkula.

2. The adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that on the evening of 20th/21st August, 2025, a secret information was received at Police Station Cyber Crime, Panchkula that some fake call centers were being operated in Twin Tower of IT Park, Sector 22, Panchkula and the operators of those call centers had been cheating

**CRM-M-65383-2025****-2-**

persons living abroad and were extracting money from them. Believing the secret information to be true, 03 raiding parties were formed. Search warrants were got issued. One of the raiding parties conducted raid at call centre named as Certys IT Services and found 28 boys and girls while conversating with foreign nationals with the help of Eyebeam and X-Lite Dialer apps and duping them of their money. They alongwith accused-Mahesh Chandra Shekhar Shetty, operator/owner of the call center were apprehended and disclosed their names and particulars. Accused-Mahesh Chandra Shekhar Shetty disclosed that he had taken those premises on rent under the garb of providing customer services to foreign nationals and had been defrauding them with the help of different softwares. He had formed different teams and some of them used to extract details by showing themselves as bank officials. He also disclosed that he was receiving the defrauded money by way of bitcoin or hawala transactions. Several laptops, earphones, mobile phones, chargers and cash amounting to Rs.8,20,000/- were recovered from the call center and taken into custody by the Police. A special investigation team was constituted to investigate the case.

3. As per the further allegations, accused-Mahesh Chandra Shekhar Shetty suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which, the accused Narender Kumar alias Munder was nominated as accused. He was arrested on 28.10.2025 and suffered disclosure statement to the effect that after the arrest of accused Krishan Lal, his uncle, the accused Rishab and Narender Kumar alias Munder had handed over a bag containing gold jewellery and property documents to him and that the

**CRM-M-65383-2025****-3-**

said bag was further handed over by him to his father-in-law Vinod Kumar i.e. the present petitioner. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. Investigation is still underway. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula vide order dated 14.11.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He does not have any criminal antecedents. His son-in-law Narender Kumar and son Vaibhav Swamy were illegally detained by Police on 28.10.2025. His son was subsequently released. His house has already been searched and nothing has been recovered. He is ready to join investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Disclosure statement of the co-accused is not admissible in evidence qua him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner, his son and son-in-law had been summoned at by Detective staff, Panchkula for the purpose of questioning and they were not kept in any illegal custody. The bag containing gold jewellery and proper documents as handed over by the accused-Narender Kumar is to be recovered from the petitioner. His custodial interrogation is required for that purpose. The gold jewellery and property documents sought to be recovered from the petitioner are part of crime proceeds but the petitioner has intentionally concealed them and has avoided appearance. No exceptional or extra-ordinary circumstance for grant of

**CRM-M-65383-2025****-4-**

bail in his favour is made out. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard rival submissions made by learned counsel for both the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is father-in-law of co-accused Narender Kumar alias Mundar, who was arrested in pursuance of disclosure statement of accused-Mahesh Chandra Shekhar Shetty and who in his own disclosure statement stated that a bag containing gold jewellery and property documents was in the custody of his father-in-law. The petitioner as such is prima facie shown to be a part of the gang which was involved in running call center for cheating foreign nationals and extracting money from them. For the purpose of eliciting information about the whereabouts of the gold jewellery and property documents bag handed over by the co-accused to him and as to the manner in which the crime was committed, his custodial interrogation is certainly required. 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. Accordingly, the petition does not deserve to be allowed and is dismissed.



CRM-M-65383-2025

-5-

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 and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

11.12.2025
Amit Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No