



CRM-M-17867 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-17867 of 2026
Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

Mayank Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.278 dated 31.12.2024 registered under Sections 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Cyber Manesar, District Gurugram.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that the petitioner committed cyber fraud with the complainant for a sum of Rs.8,40,000/-, on the pretext of sanctioning loan to him. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern or involvement with the alleged fraud. He argued that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and initially, the FIR was registered against unknown person. He further argued that the petitioner is neither the



CRM-M-17867 of 2026 **-2-**

beneficiary, nor has received any amount. He argued that the petitioner never called, met or induced the complainant at any point of time and therefore, false and frivolous allegations have been levelled against him. He further argued that no offence under Section 318(4) of BNS is made out against the petitioner as the contents of the FIR do not fulfill the ingredients of cheating in any manner. 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. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency. Hence, he prays that present petition be allowed.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, vide order dated 12.01.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR. He further argued that the mobile numbers used in the commission of the offence and the beneficiary accounts have been found to be issued/opened in the name of the present petitioner. He further argued that an amount of Rs.8,40,000/- stood



CRM-M-17867 of 2026 **-3-**

transferred in the two bank accounts of the petitioner maintained with Prathama UP Gramin Bank and Kotak Mahindra Bank, which itself shows the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. He further submitted that the petitioner is not only peripheral participant but principal architect of the conspiracy and had orchestrated a well planned conspiracy to cheat the complainant. He further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for a fair and proper investigation in the matter as well as to unearth the modus operandi of accused; to ascertain the names of other co-accused and to effect recovery of the amount involved in the alleged fraud. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and the allegations against him are serious in nature. He is alleged to have cheated and defrauded the complainant for Rs.8,40,000/- under the pretext of sanctioning a loan to him. The petitioner had deceived the complainant and played an active role in the crime. The allegations involve deep rooted conspiracy and cheating of a significant magnitude requiring full, fair and unhindered investigation. At this juncture, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to uncover the modus operandi and to recover the amount involved in the crime. While considering the plea for grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be



CRM-M-17867 of 2026 -4-

justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."



CRM-M-17867 of 2026 -5-

9. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as "**P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement**", (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in **Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)*

"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroped in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".

Economic Offences

*78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In **Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain**, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.*

XXX XXX XXX

83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is



CRM-M-17867 of 2026

-6-

protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is accordingly dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

23.04.2206*D.Bansal*

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