IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:074104

218 **CRM-M-16535-2026 (O&M)**

Mahinder ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	11.05.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	12.05.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	12.05.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Nitin Chaudhary, Advocate,
Mr. Amit Goyal, Advocate,
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tomar, Advocate and
Mr. Ravi Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

...

<u>Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).</u>

1. The instant one is the second petition for grant of regular bail as filed by the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.14, dated 10.07.2024,

registered under Sections 318(4), 319 and 61 of the BNS, at Cyber Police Station Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh. His previous petition bearing No.CRM-M-46131-2025 had been dismissed by this Court vide order dated 03.11.2025.

2. The petitioner along with co-accused is booked for commission of the aforementioned offence and is alleged to have duped the complainant of a sum of Rs.50 lakhs by making him a victim of cyber crime and by representing that the complainant could fetch huge profits by investing money in cryptocurrency. Though, he was not named in the FIR, however, during the course of investigation, some suspicious bank accounts were located in which the money received from the bank account of the complainant had been transferred. One of such bank account was operative in the name of Pragati Agro Firm operated by accused Akshay Guru. An amount of Rs.3.20 lakhs was transferred from the bank account of the complainant and was deposited in the said bank account. Investigation further revealed that an amount of Rs.2.40 lakhs was transferred from the bank account of the complainant to the bank account of the present petitioner which was subsequently transferred to a firm operated by the petitioner and co-accused Rajuddin and it was a joint account. Not only this, it was revealed that 46 other complaints were pending against the same account showing that several innocent persons had been cheated of a sum of Rs.20,75,26,292/- by use of this account. The petitioner was arrested on 29.04.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has

been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. On the basis of investigation conducted, no nexus between the petitioner and the alleged cryptocurrency trading platform has been found. There is no electronic record, communication or digital evidence to prove that the petitioner was part of the conspiracy hatched by the co-accused to cheat the complainant. He had never met the complainant. There has been no inducement on the part of the complainant in any manner whatsoever. The bank account in which certain transactions have been reflected is neither registered in his name nor operated or controlled by him. He has no concern with the premises linked with the said account. The mobile number used in commission of the subject offences does not belong to the petitioner. The complainant had voluntarily invested money in the alleged cryptocurrency platform. The petitioner has only been made a scapegoat. He is a person of limited educational background and does not possess any technical expertise. The disclosure statement of the co-accused cannot be considered to be legally admissible in evidence against him. He is in custody since long. Each day spent by him in custody has furnished a fresh ground to him to seek concession of bail. It is, thus, argued that he deserves to be extended the benefit of bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel while relying upon the status report has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The prayer made by co-accused Akshay Guru, who was in the same trail for grant of regular bail has been dismissed as withdrawn even before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. This petition, being successive one is

not maintainable as there is no substantial or drastic change in the circumstances. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing the similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have been directly involved in the cyber crime, thereby cheating the complainant and causing wrongful loss of money to him. During the course of investigation, the trail of money has been established, which shows that an amount of Rs.2,70,000/- was transferred in the bank account allegedly operated by the petitioner and co-accused in the name of a firm. As per the record of Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre, 46 complaints have been registered/pending against the joint account pertaining to the petitioner and co-accused Rajuddin. As per these complaints, a total amount of Rs.20,75,26,292/- is found to be involved. The allegations reveal active and *prima facie* participation of the petitioner in the crime. The same also indicate his involvement in the operational layer of a well organized cyber fraud, wherein the complainant was duped of a substantial amount of money. The magnitude of the amount involved, the organized manner in which the offence was committed and the role of the petitioner prima facie reflect the seriousness of the allegations levelled against him. Such like cases are on the rise and everyday one hears about innocent public persons duped of their hard earned money. The previous petition as filed by the petitioner has been dismissed by passing a detailed order. The

petitioner has failed to point out any drastic change in the circumstances. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is no compelling ground to allow the petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is clarified that any observation made in this order is only for deciding this petition and shall not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on merits.

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

12.05.2026

harjeet

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