



CRM-M-16121 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-16121 of 2026
Date of Decision: 19.05.2026

Ankit Dudi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi. DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.370 dated 14.10.2025 registered under Sections 318(4) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66-D of Information Technology Act, at Police Station Cyber Crime East, District Gurugram.
2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with co-accused duped the complainant and committed cyber fraud for a sum of Rs.1.94 Crore. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor has any



CRM-M-16121 of 2026 **-2-**

concern with the alleged fraud and initially, the FIR was registered against unknown person. It has also been contended that during investigation, co-accused Satish Bhaskar was arrested and the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the said co-accused. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. He submitted that even if prosecution version is believed to be true, then also the only allegation against the petitioner is that he provided bank account details of co-accused in lieu of commission. He further submitted that the entire case is based on documentary evidence which are already in possession of the complainant or the investigating agency, hence, nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 20.12.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record and while referring to the status report already filed in the matter, she has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner was specifically named in the disclosure statement of co-accused Satish Bhaskar. She further argued



CRM-M-16121 of 2026 **-3-**

during investigation, it was found that the petitioner acted in furtherance of the criminal conspiracy by facilitating the operation of fraudulent bank accounts used for siphoning off the cheated amount from the complainant. She further submitted that the petitioner, in his own disclosure statement, admitted his involvement in the crime and got recovered a mobile phone used in the offence. She further submitted that the petitioner has played an active role in providing bank account details to co-accused persons for routing the defrauded funds and also disclosed the involvement of the another co-accused, namely, Sanjay Kumar, which itself proves his participation in the organized cyber fraud racket. Hence, she prays that the present petition be dismissed.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. Although the petitioner was not named in the FIR initially, yet during investigation, his involvement surfaced through the disclosure statement of co-accused as well as his own disclosure statement, pursuant to which a mobile phone allegedly used in the commission of offence was recovered. The material collected during investigation prima facie indicates that the petitioner actively facilitated the operation of fraudulent bank accounts for routing the defrauded amount and acted in furtherance of the criminal conspiracy. The allegations pertain to an organized cyber fraud involving cheating and siphoning of funds, which are serious in nature and have wider societal ramifications. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking



CRM-M-16121 of 2026 -4-

bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. It is trite law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*, 2004 AIR(SC) 1866, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav v. State of Maharashtra*, (2007) 1 SCC 242 and *State through CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi*, 2005 (4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC).

6. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, coupled with the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. Accordingly, the present petition being bereft of any merit, is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

19.05.2026
D.Bansal

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