**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

234

**CRM-M No.18705 of 2026
Date of Decision: 06.05.2026**

Ankit Khurana ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Anand Chhibbar, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Utkarsh Khatana, Advocate and
Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Ms. Swati Vashisth, Advocate,
for respondent No.2-complainant.

***

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short

"BNSS") seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
210	09.06.2025	Cyber West, District Gurugram	3(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340 and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNS") and 66D of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant that in January 2025, he had received messages from one female who was administrator of a Whatsapp group named "Key to Wealth" by representing that she was part of a company which was subsidiary Company of Investment Group under the name of Indmoney Private Limited. She joined him in the above named group and induced him to join a stock market group through the App of her company named as "Indmoney PV" by representing that her company dealt in stock market and used to buy large number of shares on lower rates and alluring him on the ground of fetching handsome profits. He was induced to invest a huge amount of money and was made to believe that he had earned profit of a sum of Rs.1,26,78,750/- on his investment. When he applied for withdrawal of money on necessity having arisen, he was asked to deposit 30% of the total profit earned on account of Short Term Capital Gain Tax to the tune of Rs.41,02,226/-. He had deposited the said amount also but then came to know that he had been duped of a sum of Rs.1,46,71,187/-. As such, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. It was revealed that the money from the bank account of the complainant had been transferred to different bank accounts. The record of beneficiary account numbers were obtained. It was revealed that in the second Layer, an amount of Rs.02,50,000/- was transferred on 17.05.2025 from the account of Layer-1 operative at Punjab & Sind Bank. The said account was operative in the name of one Selective Brains Spezill Pvt. Ltd. and run by accused Yatin and also in the account of accused Sharad Kant. Both of them were joined into investigation. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting their involvement in the crime. They got recovered ATM Card, sim card and a particular phone number and gave details of net banking username and password of the abovementioned company. The record of another Layer II beneficiary which was current bank account at AU Small Finance Bank was also obtained and it was revealed that a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- was transferred on 24.05.2025 from Layer-1 bank account in which money was transferred from the account of the complainant. The said account was in the name of Daksh Enterprises under the proprietorship of the present petitioner.

4. As per the further allegations, the petitioner was joined into investigation on 23.01.2026 and was formally arrested. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered a mobile phone containing chats with Sumit Malik who was nominated as an additional accused. He also disclosed that out of the amount

of Rs.4,00,000/- received in his bank account, an amount of Rs.40,000/- was kept by him as his own commission and the remaining amount was given to the co-accused Sumit Malik. Investigation qua the petitioner stands concluded and supplementary challan against him as well as co-accused Sharad Kant and Yatin stands filed.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is sole proprietor of Daksh Enterprises which is engaged in the business of trading of shoes and slippers at Rohtak. He was not named in the FIR and has been implicated solely on the basis of a banking trail showing transfer of an amount of Rs.4,00,000/- originally withdrawn from the bank account of the complainant. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not at all made out against him as there was no inducement whatsoever on his part to cause wrongful loss to the complainant or to cheat him. Infact, the amount of Rs.4,00,000/- was received by him as repayment of pre-existing friendly loan from a person known to him. He had no knowledge whatsoever that the abovesaid amount constituted proceeds of an alleged crime and the same was received only in good faith in ordinary course of his personal financial dealings. More so, a settlement has been arrived at between him and the complainant and he had paid a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- to the complainant through a demand draft and has issued cheque for another sum of Rs.2,00,000/-. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. He is not required for further investigation as it stands completed. No useful purpose

would be served by detaining him in custody any more. He has permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. He is ready to abide by the terms and conditions to be imposed upon him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

6. Status report by the State has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he is part of a well orchestrated fraud played upon the complainant by duping him of huge amount of money. There are chances of petitioner's committing similar offences or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. One more complaint pertaining to online financial fraud is pending against him at National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. Power of Attorney on behalf of the respondent No.2-complainant has been filed. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2-complainant has affirmed the fact that a compromise has been arrived between the petitioner and the complainant and the entire amount of money which was transferred in the bank account of the petitioner has been given to the complainant. She has submitted that the complainant has no objection, if the petition is allowed.

8. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

9. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have duped the complainant of huge amount of money. His bank account was shown to be used as a beneficiary bank account in the second Layer. An

amount of Rs.4,00,000/- belonging to the complainant was transferred in his bank account from the first Layer account. Though the said amount of money has been returned by the petitioner to the complainant in pursuance of some compromise but at this stage, no relevance can be given to any such compromise. The allegations reveal active and prima facie participation of the petitioner in the crime and also clearly indicate his involvement in the operational layer of a well organized cyber fraud wherein a retired person was duped of a substantial amount of money. The magnitude of the amount involved, the organized manner in which the offence was allegedly committed and the petitioner's alleged role prima facie reflect gravity of the allegations levelled against him. Such like cases are on rise and everyday one hears about innocent persons being duped of their hard earned money. The apprehension raised by the respondent that he may commit similar offences or abscond cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. Simply because he has entered into some compromise with the complainant cannot be considered to be sufficient reason for extending benefit of bail to the petitioner. The simple plea that he was not named in the FIR does not inspire any confidence at this stage particularly when his role is clearly emerged during investigation. The offence committed by him cannot be stated to be an isolated act but part of an organized cyber fraud. Such offences are serious economic crimes affecting not only the victim but the financial system at large and, therefore, requires a strict approach at the stage of grant of bail. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the manner in which the offences were committed, the part played by the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
manju

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