IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.201

CRM-M-10033-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.03.2026

TEEPU SULTAN @ TIPU SULTAN ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA ....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Pranshul Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

*****

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 BNSS for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 264 dated 17.12.2024 registered under Sections 238(a), 241, 308(2), 318(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 351(4) and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Cyber Crime Police Station Panipat, District Panipat.

2. Brief facts of the case, as gathered from the record, are that the present FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint made by Mukesh Kumar Garg son of Shri Budh Sain Garg, resident of House No. 725, Ward No. 02, Salar Gali Bazar, Panipat. The complainant alleged that on 07.12.2024 at about 12:15 PM, he received a phone call on his mobile number from an international number and the caller represented himself to be an official from the Reserve Bank of India. The caller informed the complainant that a credit card of State Bank of India had been issued in his

name and that his documents had been misused in committing a fraud of ₹2 crores. Thereafter, on 08.12.2024 at about 10:09 PM, the complainant received a video call on WhatsApp from another number and the caller claimed to be an officer of the Mumbai Police. The caller allegedly informed the complainant that he was being digitally arrested in connection with the said fraud and kept the complainant engaged on video call for several hours.

3. It is further alleged that the caller threatened the complainant with arrest and also threatened to implicate his family members, and demanded money to settle the matter. Out of fear, the complainant transferred an amount of ₹65,00,000/- through RTGS from his Indian Bank account. Subsequently, the complainant again received video calls on different dates and was asked to deposit further amounts. Acting under the alleged pressure, the complainant transferred ₹23,00,000/- through RTGS from his Punjab National Bank account on 12.12.2024 and thereafter deposited another amount of ₹12,00,000/- in an ICICI Bank account on 16.12.2024. In this manner, unknown persons allegedly impersonating government officials committed an online fraud of about ₹1 crore with the complainant. After realizing that he had been cheated, the complainant contacted the cyber helpline and lodged an online complaint, pursuant to which the present FIR was registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Panipat and investigation was initiated.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role whatsoever in the alleged commission of the offence. It is contended that multiple FIRs have been registered against the petitioner arising out of the same incident,

which itself demonstrates the arbitrary action of the investigating agency. It is further argued that there is a complete absence of any specific role attributed to the petitioner in the alleged fraud. The petitioner had no role in the transfer of the alleged amount and neither had any authority nor access to effect such transactions. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no connection with the alleged changed mobile numbers or email IDs as attributed by the prosecution.

5. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner had acted in good faith and had in fact prompted the complainant in FIR No. 374 dated 11.12.2024 to file a cyber complaint regarding the alleged fraud. It is contended that the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the alleged crime and no amount has been credited to any account connected with him. It is further argued that the petitioner has already been granted bail in the connected FIR No. 374 dated 11.12.2024, which arises out of the same incident and pertains to similar allegations. It is also contended that the petitioner is suffering from serious medical ailments and his medical condition is extremely critical. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was admitted at PGI, Rohtak on 05.02.2025 due to acute abdominal pain accompanied by shortness of breath, fever and persistent cough. It is further argued that the petitioner had to visit the jail hospital at Gurugram on several occasions due to recurring abdominal pain and breathing complications. Considering the seriousness of his medical condition, he was referred to the Department of Gastroenterology, PGIMS, Rohtak for specialized treatment. It is submitted that the continuous medical complications and the requirement of expert medical supervision clearly demonstrate that the petitioner requires proper

and sustained medical care, which cannot be adequately ensured while he remains in custody. On these grounds, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel has opposed the present bail application and submitted that the role attributed to the petitioner is serious in nature. It is contended that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of cyber fraud by misusing his position as a personal banker at DBS Bank, DLF Phase-II, Gurugram. It is further argued that the petitioner knowingly shared confidential bank account details of Janta Garage (account holder Mohit Kumar) with co-accused Mohammad Mosin Siddque and conspired to use the said account for receiving the proceeds of fraud. It is further submitted that the petitioner facilitated preparation of a fake stamp in the name of Janta Garage, enabled forgery of signatures and fraudulently updated the registered mobile number and email ID of the said account so as to substitute the genuine contact details with fake credentials, thereby ensuring that the actual account holder remained unaware of the transactions. Learned State counsel further submitted that the said bank account was thereafter used to receive the fraudulent funds which were subsequently transferred by the co-accused persons. It is also argued that the petitioner has been found involved in two other FIRs as per the record verified through the ICJS portal, including FIR No. 374 dated 11.12.2024 registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, Gurugram and FIR No. 01 dated 06.01.2025 registered at Police Station Crime Branch, Gwalior, M.P., which further indicates his involvement in similar offences. On these grounds, it is submitted that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case with their able assistance. The petitioner has been in custody for the last about one year and one month. It has been argued on behalf of the petitioner that the present FIR is an offshoot of the earlier FIR No. 374 dated 11.12.2024, in which the petitioner has already been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench. In the said case, the Coordinate Bench had observed that it would be a matter of trial as to whether it was the petitioner who had accessed the bank account of the complainant and changed the registered mobile number and email ID in order to carry out the alleged transactions. It has further been pointed out that the petitioner has placed on record the WhatsApp chat between him and the complainant, wherein the petitioner had specifically asked the complainant to lodge a complaint with the Cyber Cell when unusual transactions had taken place in the complainant's account and a huge amount had been deposited therein from an unknown source.

8. Another factor which weighs with this Court is the medical condition of the petitioner. It has been brought on record that the petitioner has been suffering from serious medical ailments and had to be admitted in PGI/PGIMS, Rohtak due to acute abdominal pain, breathing complications, fever and persistent cough and was referred to the Department of Gastroenterology for specialized treatment. The medical record also reflects that he had to visit the jail hospital on multiple occasions due to recurring abdominal pain and respiratory complications. It is further noticed that out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined so far and, therefore, the trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude.

Keeping in view the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the fact that the petitioner has already been granted bail in the connected FIR arising out of the same incident, the nature of allegations which would ultimately be a matter of evidence during trial, the medical condition of the petitioner and the slow pace of trial, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite period.

9. Consequently, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner Teepu Sultan @ Tipu Sultan is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate and subject to the condition that he shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence any witness in any manner.

10. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

07.03.2026
Anu

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