HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:61879
CRL.P No. 15694 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010700512026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S VISHWAJITH SHETTY

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 15694 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SUNEEL SINGH
PROPRIETOR
M/S AMAR ENTERPRISES
S/O AMAR SINGH
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
R/AT. BARGAON, KUSHINAGAR
UTTAR PRADESH - 274 303.

...PETITIONER

(BY Ms. MANISHA Y, ADV., FOR
Ms. JANAVI R, ADV.)

AND:

STATE BY EAST CEN P.S
NOW UNDER INVESTIGATION BY CID
REPRESENTED BY HIGH COURT
GOVERNMENT PROSECUTOR.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI CHANNAPPA ERAPPA, HCGP)

Digitally signed by NANDINI D
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 438 CR.P.C (U/S 482 BNSS) PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENT POLICE TO RELEASE THE PETITIONER ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL IN THE EVENT OF HIS ARREST IN CR.NO.424/2025 REGISTERED BY EAST CEN CRIME P.S., BENGALURU AND TRANSFERRED TO CYBER CRIME DIVISION, CID, BENGALURU, FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 66(C) AND 66(D) OF I.T ACT, 2000, U/S 318(4) OF BNS, 2023, PENDING BEFORE THE I ACJM, BENGALURU.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S VISHWAJITH SHETTY

CNR: KAHC010700512026

ORAL ORDER

1. This petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, is filed seeking anticipatory bail in Crime No.424/2025 registered by East CEN Crime Police Station, Bengaluru City, for the offences punishable under Section 318(4) of BNS, 2023, and Sections 66(C) & 66(D) of Information Technology Act, 2000.

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

3. FIR in Crime No.424/2025 was registered by East CEN Crime Police Station, Bengaluru City, against unknown persons for the aforesaid offences based on the first information dated 12.12.2025 received from V.Chandrasekaran S/o late A.E.Vasudevan., aged about 86 years. Apprehending arrest in the said case, petitioner had filed Crl. Misc. No.9402/2026 before the jurisdictional Sessions Court, which was rejected on 29.09.2026. Therefore, petitioner is before this Court.

4. In the first information submitted by the victim who is a senior citizen, it is stated that on 24.07.2025, he was contacted by a person by a person who introduced himself as Praveen Patel through whatsapp call from mobile bearing No.86703

69608, who added him to a whatsapp group - NSE road to wealth C-4 and offered stock advisory and investment in primary market operations, institutional stocks and IPOs, etc. Subsequently, first informant allegedly invested totally a sum of Rs.3,16,39,327/- for the period from 24.07.2025 to December 2025 and subsequently, he was denied access to the trading platform. It is under these circumstances, the first informant had approached the police.

5. The material on record would go to show that the first informant had transferred the aforesaid amount on various dates through bank transactions from his two bank accounts maintained with HDFC Bank and Canara Bank, respectively. The material collected by the Investigation Officer during the course of investigation, reveals that amount of Rs.30,02,454/- was directly transferred from the account of the first informant to the bank account bearing No.20100068061022 maintained in Bandhan Bank in the name of M/s. Amar Enterprises, of which the petitioner is the Proprietor. Therefore, petitioner is the primary beneficiary and he is the first layer in respect of the amount transferred directly from the bank account of the first

informant in the present case. Petitioner has failed to give valid explanation for the said amount received by him directly in his bank account.

6. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, during the course of arguments, has contended that the person who had borrowed an amount of Rs.12 lakhs from the petitioner, had asked his bank particulars and on his instructions, the aforesaid amount has been deposited. However, the particulars of the said person has not been disclosed by the petitioner.

7. The learned Sessions Judge after having perused the bank account submitted by the petitioner, has observed that the genuineness of the said transaction is doubtful and the petitioner has not approached the Court with clean hands and he has suppressed the material facts. Under the circumstances, I am of the opinion that his prayer for grant of anticipatory bail cannot be entertained. Accordingly, petition is dismissed.

Sd/
(S VISHWAJITH SHETTY)
JUDGE

KK