



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

1.

CRM-M-31193-2025

ANSHUL KAUSHIK @ ANSHUL SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent
2.

CRM-M-29739-2025 (O&M)

SURESH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent
3.

CRM-M-30784-2025

SANJEEV KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent
4.

CRM-M-33861-2025 (O&M)

KAMLESH AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent
5.

CRM-M-34316-2025 (O&M)

RAJ KUMAR ALIAS RAJU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent



6.

CRM-M-34068-2025

MONU DHILLON

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent
7.

CRM-M-40510-2025

ROHAN BAVISKAR

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent
8.

CRM-M-40512-2025

SAIPH ALI

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent
9.

CRM-M-55187-2025

PIYUSH NAYAK

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent

Decided on : 11.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Kanishk Swaroop, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-29739-2025).

Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate (*through VC mode*),
for the petitioner(s)
(in CRM-M-31193-2025, CRM-M-30784-2025).
Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-34316-2025).



Mr. Vivek Dahiya, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-55187-2025).

Mr. Arman Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-34068-2025).
Mr. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-33861-2025).
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s)
(in CRM-M-40510-2025, CRM-M-40512-2025).

Mr. Sachin Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-37881-2025).

Mr.Satbir Singh Goripuria, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. This common order shall dispose of all the aforementioned petitions, as the same arise out of common FIR.
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 hereunder:-

Serial No.	Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
1.	Anshul Kaushik @ Anshul Sharma	104	25.11.2024	308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023	Cyber Crime	Sonapat
2.	Suresh			308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023		



3.	Sanjeev Kumar			308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023		
4.	Kamlesh and Jagdish			238(c), 308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023		
5.	Raj Kumar alias Raju			238(c), 308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023		
6.	Monu Dhillon			308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023 (section 238(c) of BNS added later on)		
7.	Rohan Baviskar			308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023		
8.	Saiph Ali			308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of BNS, 2023		
9.	Piyush Nayak			308(5), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2)		



				and 61 of		
				BNS, 2023		

3. On the very outset, counsel for the petitioner – Piyush Nayak, (in CRM-M-55187-2025), submits that he seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

4. Accordingly, petition, i.e. CRM-M-55187-2025 stands dismissed as withdrawn.

5. Referring to the allegations mentioned in the FIR, counsel for the petitioners contends that complainant, Vinod Chaudhary, has been victimised by the accused persons through fraudulent means, resulting in a loss of Rs.1,78,55,000/-.

6. It is stated that the complainant received threatening phone calls on his mobile number 9896224636 and 9996189066 from various mobile numbers, i.e. 9788614643, 9918085847, 8959858412, 8093278491, and 8093296026. During these calls, the callers allegedly threatened the complainant with implication in a money laundering case, in the name of Ashok Gupta (Case No.2212186). The callers warned that to avoid arrest and further involvement in the said case, the complainant must immediately transfer a substantial amount of money. Under pressure, the complainant transferred a total sum of Rs.1,78,55,000/- to seven different bank accounts, as detailed in the FIR.

For reference, all particulars including the account numbers and the amount transferred therein, are reproduced here under:-



S. N.	Date	Account debited from	Account credited to	IFSC Code	Transaction ID	Amount (Rs.)
1	14.11.2024	030201519399	0119619000005155	xxxx	xxxx	43,50,000/-
2	16.11.2024	919010072421194	43183842370	xxxx	xxxx	61,30,000/-
3	18.11.2024	030201520352	502000494653682	xxxx	xxxx	31,80,000/-
4	18.11.2024	3077281424	1251000102100287	xxxx	xxxx	7,30,000/-
5	19.11.2024	021999300000056	16020100011534	xxxx	xxxx	5,50,000/-
6	19.11.2024	51027766168	160201000011534	xxxx	xxxx	1,70,000/-
7	20.11.2024	030201519399	24190110147405	xxxx	xxxx	27,45,000/-
8	Total			xxxx	xxxx	1,78,55,000/-

5. On doing investigation, final report under Section 193 of BNSS has been submitted against total 13 accused, which are named as under:-

- I. Monu Dhillon
- II. Sanjeev
- III. Anshul
- IV. Ankit Raikwar
- V. Raj Kumar
- VI. Ravinder @ Ravi Beniwal
- VII. Piyush Nayak alias Anna
- VIII. Ishan Behgal
- IX. Rohan Baviskar
- X. Saif Ali
- XI. Suresh
- XII. Kamlesh
- XIII. Jagdish



6. Details of the amounts credited to the accounts of all the accused persons (petitioners herein) involved in the present case, and total period of custody undergone by them, are as under:-

Sr. No.	Particulars of the case and names of accused persons	Amount involved	Total custody undergone
1.	CRM-M-29739-2025 Suresh vs. State of Haryana	Rs.2,60,011/-	Since 07.01.2025
2.	CRM-M-8346-2025 Anshul Kaushik vs. State of Haryana	Rs.2,40,888/-	Since 30.11.2024
3.	CRM-M-33861-2025 Kamlesh and another vs. State of Haryana	Kamlesh Received:- Rs.2,98,892/- Jagdish received:- Rs.5,00,000/-	Since 07.01.2025
4.	CRM-M-34316-2025 Raj Kumar vs. State of Haryana	Rs.4.8 lacs	Since 13.02.2025
5.	CRM-M-40510-2025 Rohan Baviskar vs. State of Haryana	Rs.2,70,000/- received from Saifh Ali out of which Rs.1,70,000/- transferred to Ishan Behgal Recovery:- Rs.10,000/-	Since 19.12.2024
6.	CRM-M-40512-2025 Saiph Ali vs. State of Haryana	Rs.4,00,000/- as commission out of which Rs.2,70,000/- amount transferred to Rohan Baviskar Recovery Rs.6,000/-	Since 24.12.2024
7.	CRM-M-55187-2025 Piyush Nayak vs. State of Haryana	Rs.61,30,000/-	Since 19.12.2024



8.	CRM-M-34068-2025 Monu Dhillon vs. State of Haryana	Rs.3,94,962/-	Since 30.11.2024
9.	CRM-M-30784-2025 Sanjeev Kumar vs. State of Haryana	Rs.3,94,962/-	Since 30.11.2024

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, as per the investigation report based on the disclosure statement of the arrested accused Raj Kumar, an amount of Rs.4,81,000/- was transferred on 14.11.2024 from a Yes Bank account to his SBI Bank account. Subsequently, in a second disclosure statement, it was revealed that Rs.1,80,000/- from the said amount was the share of accused Ravinder @ Ravi Beniwal, out of which Rs.1,60,000/- has already been recovered by the investigating agency.

8. On asking by the Court, learned counsel for the respective petitioners submit that, for the purpose of consideration of their prayer for bail, petitioners are willing to deposit the alleged amount credited in their bank accounts, which is indicated in the investigation report in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt(s), issued by a nationalised bank, before the trial Court.

9. Counsel for the respective petitioners further argue that all the alleged offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, and the process of recording the statements of witnesses is likely to take a considerable amount of time. It is also contended that the entire amount involved in the alleged cyber fraud, which was defrauded from the



complainant, is lying in the respective bank accounts, and the prosecution is already in possession of the necessary details.

10. On the other hand, learned State Counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the offences in question are of serious nature and are increasingly prevalent in society. Thus, petitioners do not deserve any leniency with regard to their release on bail.

11. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

12. In view of totality of circumstances, and the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioners and other factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioners.

13. Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions, i.e. CRM-M-31193-2025, CRM-M-29739-2025, CRM-M-30784-2025, CRM-M-33861-2025, CRM-M-34316-2025, CRM-M-34068-2025 CRM-M-40510-2025 and CRM-M-40512-2025 are **allowed**.

14. **Petition, i.e. CRM-M-55187-2025 stands dismissed as withdrawn, as already discussed here above.**

15. Petitioners, namely Anshul Kaushik alias Anshul Sharma, Suresh, Sanjeev Kumar, Kamlesh, Jagdish, Raj Kumar alias Raju, Monu Dhillon, Rohan Baviskar and Saiph Ali, are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the



learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

However, grant of regular bail to the petitioners shall be subject to deposit of the respective amount(s), as reflected against each of them in the investigation report, and having been mentioned in the table as described in paragraph No.6 of this order, in the form of FDR(s) issued by a nationalised bank, before the trial Court/Court concerned. It will be the sole responsibility of the accused/petitioners so released on bail, to get the FDR renewed from time to time, and realization of the FDR(s) would be subject to the final outcome of the case.

16. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

17. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

18. Accordingly, all the petitions stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

11.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: ✓ YES/NO
Whether Reportable: ✓ YES/NO