



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

103

CRM-M-25337-2026

Date of Decision: 05.05.2026

KRISHAN KUMAR AND ANR**... PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****... RESPONDENT**

Present:- Mr. S.K.Sirsa, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS 2023 (Earlier 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No. 23 dated 27.11.2024 under Section 318(4) of BNS of 2023 (earlier 420 of IPC), Police Station Cyber Crime Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners duped the complainant of a sum of ₹12,00,000/-. The complainant was contacted by an unknown lady, namely Neha Jain, who induced him to invest money on the pretext of earning profits through share trading. Acting upon such inducement, the complainant transferred various amounts into different bank accounts, out of which a sum of ₹5,00,000/- was transferred into the account of petitioner No. 2.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioners have never contacted the complainant. The entire case of the prosecution against the petitioners rests solely on bank transactions, and in



cyber fraud cases, bank accounts of innocent persons are often misused by the actual fraudsters. The petitioners are ready and willing to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Malvika Singh, DAG,Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She has vehemently opposed the prayer made by ld. counsel for the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners have actively participated in the alleged offence. She further submits that the phone number of petitioner No. 2 is linked with the cyber fraud.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the petitioners duped the complainant of a sum of ₹12,00,000/-, and that the bank account into which the defrauded amount was transferred belongs to petitioner Krishan and is linked with the mobile number of petitioner Jagdish, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary for recovery of the defrauded amount. This Court does not find it to be a fit case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

05.05.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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