IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37724 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010528242026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-42 Year-2026 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Saran

==========

Anupam Kumar S/o Gayanchand Rai Resident of Village - Lakhanpur, P.S. - Mashrakh, Dist. - Saran.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. S.P. Cyber Crime and Security Unit Baily Road, Patna.

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP
For the C.C.S.U : Mr. Vishwanath Prasad Sinha, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

11 04-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State, learned senior counsel for the C.C.S.U. and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Saran Cyber P.S. Case No. 42 of 2026, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2), 318(4), 319(2), 338, 336(3), 112/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, read with Sections 66(c) and 66(D) of I.T. Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner allegedly provided his IDBI Bank account to co-accused Sonu Kumar Yadav for facilitating cyber frauds in lieu of

WEB COPY

commission. It is alleged that ₹1,28,64,118/- (approximately ₹1.28 crore) was transacted through the account and the petitioner received ₹55,000/- as commission.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner has not committed any such offence as alleged against him. The petitioner is not involved in any kind of cyber fraud. It is submitted that co-accused Sonu Kumar took access of the petitioner's bank account and transacted the amount of ₹1,28,64,118/- (approximately ₹1.28 crore) through his account. It is further submitted that the trial is in progress and three witnesses have already been examined in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 18.03.2026 and has got one criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the C.C.S.U. have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP for the State also submits that the petitioner allegedly opened an IDBI Bank account in conspiracy with the prime accused, Sonu Kumar Yadav, for

WEB COPY

routing cyber fraud proceeds amounting to approximately ₹1.28 crore, against which 30 complaints were registered on the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal. It is further submitted that the petitioner allegedly confessed to lending the account to the cyber gang for a 5% commission and received Rs. 55,000/- therefrom. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial and conclude the same preferably within a period of six months. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

U		T	

WEB COPY