2026:PHHC:090123

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

248 **CRM-M-33339-2026**
Date of decision: 3rd July, 2026

Vasim

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jagtej Singh Kang, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Talim Hussain, Advocate for the complainant.

***

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 245 dated 12.09.2025 registered under Sections 318(4) and 319 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Cyber Crime, Manesar, Gurguram.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant, Prithvi Singh, alleging therein that on 11.08.2025, he received a call on his cell phone from mobile No. 89053-92838, and the caller, while introducing himself as Satish Kumar, an Army officer, told him that his name was disclosed to him and his number was given by the brother of the complainant and that he needed milk for Amethi Military School, Manesar. The complainant, who was involved in the business of milk supply, gave his consent for the purpose of supplying milk on the asking of

the said caller. The caller told him to supply 40 kgs of milk, 5 kgs of paneer and 10 kgs of curd on daily basis in the military school for the next four months and also sent the location of the school. On his asking, the complainant went to Amethi Military School, Manesar, on 12.08.2025 along with the milk and other items as ordered and, on reaching there, he made a call to the above-named Satish Kumar, who told him that his superior officer would make a video call to him. The complainant further alleged that thereafter, he received a video call from cell No. 805-313-2953 and one person, who was wearing an Army uniform, started conversing with him and told him to give details of his *PhonePe* App so that payment could be made in advance. The complainant disclosed the details of his *PhonePe* account and immediately thereafter, the video call was disconnected. On checking his account, the complainant realized that he had been made a victim of cybercrime, as an amount of Rs.7,15,000/- was withdrawn from his bank account by hacking his mobile phone at the same time by way of different transactions. The complainant tried to contact the caller but could not succeed. He prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. During investigation, the investigating agency traced the defrauded amount flowing from the complainant's *PhonePe* account to the credit cards of accused Tarif Hussain and Rashid Khan. The phone numbers from which calls had come to the complainant, were found registered in the names of Mustaq and Jugnu, respectively. The call detail records of those phone numbers were procured and the same were found to be connected with accused Jalaluddin @Jallu, who was already arrested in a case bearing FIR

No.53, registered at Police Station Cyber South, New Delhi, under Sections 318(4) and 319(2) of BNS. The presence of accused Jalaluddin was secured by way of a production warrant. He was interrogated and suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. Accused Rashid was also arrested on 23.02.2026. He too suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. He disclosed that on the asking of the present petitioner and co-accused Aamir, he had given his IDFC card to them. In lieu thereof, the petitioner and co-accused had given a sum of Rs.50,000/- to him. On the basis of his disclosure, the petitioner and Aamir were nominated as accused and were arrested on 24.02.2026. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. The petitioner disclosed that on being told by his brother-in-law Sharukh, about the manner in which offences of cybercrimes were committed and on his asking to arrange for credit cards *in lieu* of money and further out of greed, he had asked accused Rashid to give his IDFC card to him *in lieu* of money. He along with his co-accused Aamir, had received a sum of Rs.70,000/- by giving the said card to accused Sharukh and the said amount was distributed amongst himself, accused Aamir and Rashid. Investigation qua the petitioner now stands complete.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which cannot be considered to be legally admissible in evidence. The amount of money transferred in the account of co-accused Rashid has been returned by him to the complainant. He is in custody since 24.02.2026.

No recovery has been effected from him. He has clean antecedents. He has a permanent abode and there are no chances of his absconding. He is not a flight risk. He is not required for further investigation. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Mr. Talim Hussain, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed his *Vakalatnama*.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, while relying upon the status report, has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. He worked as a conduit for receiving and circulating the proceeds of the crime and was a part of the conspiracy hatched with the co-accused. His role has been duly spelt out in the disclosure statement of the co-accused. He was a member of a well-organized and structured cyber fraud ring engaged in defrauding innocent complainant. There are chances of his committing similar offences, if extended the benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

8. The petitioner is alleged to be a part of the conspiracy hatched with the co-accused to deceive the complainant and to cause wrongful loss of Rs.7,50,000/- to him by hacking his mobile phone. The petitioner, in connivance with co-accused Rashid, is alleged to have made the bank account of accused Rashid available for the purpose of transfer of an amount of

Rs.8,45,000/- out of the aforesaid amount of Rs.7,50,000/- for the purpose of cheating the victim. He is also alleged to have facilitated the availability of the bank account of the co-accused for the purpose of commission of the offence of cyber crime. The role of the petitioner has clearly emerged during investigation. The offence in question is not an isolated act but part of an organized cyber fraud, wherein providing bank channels forms a crucial link in the execution of the crime. Cyber crimes are steadily increasing and are having a deep-rooted impact on society, whereby unsuspecting citizens are targeted and the confidence of the public in digital platforms is eroding. The subject offences are serious economic crimes affecting not only the victim but the financial system at large and, therefore, require a strict approach at the stage of bail. The gamut of above discussed circumstances does not call for grant of benefit of bail to the petitioner. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the role attributed to him, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

9. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

3rd July, 2026
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	*Yes / No*
2. Whether reportable	:	*Yes / No*