IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

126

1) CRM-M-21717-2025
Decided on : 07.03.2026

Chander Mohan

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

2) CRM-M-27537-2025

Pankaj Narang

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

3) CRM-M-60443-2025

Rohit Goyal

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. B.S. Aulakh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-21717-2025).

Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate for
Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-27537-2025).

Mr. Munish Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-60443-2025).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

****

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-21717-2025, CRM-M-27537-2025 and CRM-M-60443-2025, as all the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-21717-

2025.

2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Chander Mohan (petitioner in CRM-M-21717-2025)	001	21.06.2024	420, 120-B of IPC and 66-D of IT Act	Cyber Crime	Ludhiana
Pankaj Narang (petitioner in CRM-M-27537-2025)					
Rohit Goyal (petitioner in CRM-M-60443-2025)					

3. In the present cases, on 12.11.2025 and subsequently, on 10.12.2025, following orders were passed:-

*"**<u>Order dated 12.11.2025</u>:-***

1. Learned State counsel has filed status report dated 11.11.2025 (in CRM-M-60443-2025), in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

2. As per the status report filed in the bail petition of the petitioner Pankaj Narang (CRM-M-27537-2025), the total defrauded amount is Rs.4,35,69,550/-. In the course of fraud, a sum of Rs.23,25,000/- was transferred to the bank account No.0734102100001487 of the petitioner Pankaj Narang, held with Punjab National Bank.

3. However, it remains unclear what amount, if any, was transferred to the bank account of Rohit Goyal (petitioner in CRM-M-60443-2025), having bank account number 0734102100001487 with Punjab National Bank, which he had opened with monetary consideration of Rs. 10,000/-.

4. Counsel for the petitioner, namely, Pankaj Narang in CRM-M-27537-2025 is directed to obtain necessary instructions regarding deposit of the aforementioned amount. Further, the required details concerning the accused Chander Mohan (petitioner in CRM-M-21717-2025) shall also be furnished.

5. Position shall also be clarified as to whether any part of the total defrauded amount was deposited into the bank account of petitioner Chander Mohan.

6. List again on 10.12.2025.

7. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases."

*"**Order dated 10.12.2025:-***

i) Present petitions have been filed by petitioners namely, Chander Mohan, Pankaj Narang and Rohit Goyal, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 1 dated 21.06.2024, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC (Section 66-D IT Act was added later on), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

ii) Complainant Rashpal Singh has been defrauded through a cybercrime committed by the accused persons, involving a total amount of Rs. 4,35,69,550/-.

iii) Allegation against Pankaj Narang (petitioner in CRM-M-27537-2025) is that an amount of Rs. 23,25,000/- was transferred to his bank account, which was managed/operated by his co-accused, namely Chander Mohan (petitioner in CRM-M-21717-2025), through another co-accused, Rohit Goyal (petitioner in CRM-M-60443-2025). Accordingly, as per the allegations, all three accused mentioned above are found responsible for the duped amount of Rs. 23,25,000/-.

iv) While dismissing the bail petition, Court noticed in paragraph 7 of the order dated 15.04.2025 that plea for bail of accused-Pankaj Narang was rejected. It was observed that although challan had been submitted, investigation appeared to be inadequately conducted, as no action had been taken against one of prime accused-Vikram Yadav, in whose bank account an amount of Rs. 60 lakhs was found deposited.

Court also noticed the bail order dated 01.04.2025 concerning co-accused-Dharminder Kumar, wherein it was again recorded that the investigation conducted by the Investigating Officer was unsatisfactory.

v) Let copy of this order be forwarded to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana, to clarify who the Investigating Officer is and why the aforementioned lapses occurred under his/her supervision.

vi) List again on 02.02.2026.

vii) A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases."

4. On a regular basis, this Court has been confronted with cases wherein innocent depositors have been defrauded by a new trend of crimes

committed by cyber criminals. Realising the mental agony, helplessness, and suffering faced by such victims, this Court has already dealt with the issue in **CRM-M-71214-2025**, titled as, ***"Sanjay @ Sanju Vs. State of Haryana"*** decided on **17.02.2026**, and the observations recorded therein are reproduced here-under.

> *"3. With the prevailing circumstances, bank account holders are seriously developing a sense of insecurity regarding their hard-earned money deposited in the banks. The emerging trend of cybercrimes, as reflected in the present case, requires strict scrutiny and the application of strong deterrent principles.*
>
> *4. It is particularly necessary to adopt such an approach because there exists no immediate statutory mechanism to provide prompt relief to an account holder who urgently requires the amount deposited in his bank account after being defrauded. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the amount which is undisputedly found to have been deposited/credited/transferred into the bank account of the accused seeking bail should either be refunded to the complainant-victim or, at the very least, deposited before the Court in the form of an FDR along with accrued interest, so that the grievance of the complainant is redressed without undue delay.*
>
> *5. This Court expresses this concern especially for the reason that the defrauded amount may never be recovered by the complainant, and the conclusion of the criminal trial/case may take several years, or even a decade. Even in the event of conviction, it may not provide real or immediate relief to the victim. Despite being given an opportunity to deposit/pay the amount of ₹75,000/- at the first instance, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had merely permitted the use of his bank account for a limited purpose, for which he was paid ₹4,000/- and therefore he is not ready to deposit the complete amount of Rs.75,000/-, which even was credited in his bank account.*
>
> *6. In the interest of protecting citizens and securing the safety of funds deposited in banks, funds which are often misused when account holders share their details with individuals involved in cybercrime, this Court is of the view that a stringent approach is warranted.*
>
> *7. Since learned counsel for the petitioner has categorically refused to deposit the aforesaid amount, this Court does not find any special reason to extend discretionary relief to the petitioner at this stage, particularly while balancing the considerations of personal liberty with the larger societal interest. This view is supported by the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court*

*in '**Serious Fraud Investigation Office v. Aditya Sarda', 2025 INSC 477**', wherein it has been reiterated that economic offences constitute a class apart and must be dealt with a stringent approach at the stage of bail. The Hon'ble Apex Court observed that grant of bail in serious financial fraud cases should be considered with greater caution, keeping in view the gravity of the offence, its impact on society, and the larger public interest.*

In view of the above, present petition stands dismissed."

5. After noticing all the aforementioned facts, and being conscious of the gravity of the allegations as well as the pain and agony suffered by the depositors who have been deprived of their hard-earned money, this Court finds no merit in the present petitions. The magnitude of the fraud and the breach of trust involved do not warrant application of the principle of leniency at this stage. **Accordingly, all the petitions stand dismissed**..

6. However, it is observed that in case the petitioners express their willingness to deposit the defrauded amount, either by way of Fixed Deposit Receipts (FDRs) to secure the interest of the victims or by directly refunding the amount to the respective depositors, they shall be at liberty to file fresh bail petitions, which shall be considered on their own merits in accordance with law.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 07, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No