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

137 (05 cases)

CRM-M-34266-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-40884-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-61043-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-68333-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-71112-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2026

1. CRM-M-34266-2025

Suresh ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

2. CRM-M-40884-2025

Manjeet Singh ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

3. CRM-M-61043-2025

Gursewak Singh @ Sunny ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

4. CRM-M-68333-2025

Keshav Parkash ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

5. CRM-M-71112-2025

Mohd. Sameer ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Deepak Singh Saini and Ms. Vamika Johar, Advocates, for the petitioner in CRM-M-34266-2025.

Mr. Anshuman Dalal, Advocate for the petitioner in CRM-M-40884-2025.

Mr. Karnail Singh Ahhi and Mr. Rupinder Singh, Advocates for the petitioner in CRM-M-61043-2025.

Mr. Vikram Rana, Advocate for the petitioner

137 (05 cases) CRM-M-34266-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-40884-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-61043-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-68333-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-71112-2025 (O&M)

in CRM-M-68333-2025.
Mr. Rakesh Verma and Mr. Manish Verma, Advocates for the petitioner in CRM-M-71112-2025.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. B.S. Mamli, Advocate for the complainant in all petitions.

*****

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

All these petitions are being decided by a common order, as the same arise out of the same case bearing FIR No.64 dated 04.10.2024 registered under Sections 61(2), 318(4), 319(2), 308(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66-C of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Kurukshetra, Haryana having been filed by different accused for grant of regular/anticipatory bail, details whereof are mentioned hereinbelow:-

Sr. No	Name of the petitioner	Case No.	Relief sought
1.	Suresh	CRM-M-34266-2025	Regular bail
2.	Manjeet Singh	CRM-M-40884-2025	Anticipatory bail
3.	Gursewak Singh @ Sunny	CRM-M-61043-2025	Regular bail
4.	Keshav Parkash	CRM-M-68333-2025	Regular bail
5.	Mohd. Sameer	CRM-M-71112-2025	Regular bail

2. For the facility of reference, facts are being referred to from CRM-M-34266-2025 titled as "***Suresh Vs. State of Haryana***".

3. Brief facts of the present case are that the complainant is a retired Assistant Professor, having mobile SIM Card No.98965-44980. Her husband has already expired, but his mobile SIM Card No.98963-62499 is still with her. She further alleged that she has bank accounts in five different banks. The complainant received a call on her mobile from mobile No.95805-05659 on

13.09.2024 at about 11:28 A.M. and the caller told his name as Arun Kumar, who stated that he was making a call from TRAI. The said person further stated that a complaint had been lodged against her on 08.08.2024 for uploading pornographic contents on the internet and that her Aadhar Card was attached with the same. Complainant further alleged that the said person then transferred the call to some other person, who claimed to be Constable Vikram. The said Constable Vikram further forwarded the call to the alleged Investigating Officer Anand Rana, who also informed that her Aadhar Card was attached with three bank accounts, through which illegal business of money laundering was being done. He asked her to come to Mumbai for moving complaint, but she told him that due to old age, she would not be able to visit Mumbai. The said person then asked her whether she had deposited the copy of her Aadhar Card at Mumbai, Goa. Uttar Pradesh, Haryana or Kerala, to which she replied that in September, 2023 she had visited Ayodhya along with some other ladies. Complainant further alleged that on the asking of said person, she sent a copy of her Aadhar Card through WhatsApp. The said person Anand Rana then made a video call to her mobile from mobile No.85285-76914 and asked her about one Mohammad Islam Nawab Malik, who was engaged in the illegal business of money laundering, but she stated that she did not know any such person. Thereafter, Anand Rana started scaring her on the pretext that she would be sent to Jail. He also collected information about her daughter and son-in-law and stated that if she did not follow their instructions, her daughter would be deported from America. Complainant further alleged that Anand Rana kept her under digital arrest and she remained present with them through video calls. On 17.09.2024, on the asking of Anand Rana, she downloaded

SKYPE Mobile Application and opened an account in the name of Vibha Singh. Thereafter, she made a call on Maharashtra Emergency Portal live:.cid.fo6be27ea5fb-d979 at about 10:23 A.M. and the person who attended her call, introduced himself as DCP, threatened her and sent a link of Supreme Court of India i.e. https://www.scigov.cn. The complainant was then asked to withdraw the money lying in the fixed deposits and she acted accordingly. She thereafter deposited Rs.20,00,000/-, Rs.28,50,000/-, Rs.69.00,000/-, Rs.59,00,000/-, Rs.8,50,000/-, Rs.30,00,000/-, Rs.20,00,000/-, Rs.4,00,000/-, Rs.5,00,000/-, Rs.2,75,000/- in different bank accounts of different persons. As per the complainant, in total she had deposited Rs.2,46,75,000/- in the said accounts. Thus, the complainant prayed that strict action be taken against the accused persons and her money be returned to her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that the petitioners are not kingpin in the entire transaction and that they had only forwarded their accounts for minor gains. It is contended that as against the sum of Rs.2.46 Crores approximately deposited by complainant-Vibha Singh, a sum of Rs.69,00,000/- had been received in the account of M/s Shri Ridhi Siddhi Recording Studios and Films which was under the proprietorship of one Parkash Ram Dewra. A disclosure of the said Parkash Ram Dewra was recorded wherein he stated that he had given his account to Suresh (petitioner in CRM-M-34266-2025) on the asking of one Vishnu who was working in the studio for commission at the rate of 1%. The petitioner-Suresh was thereafter arrested on 01.04.2025 and a sum of Rs.2,000/- had been recovered from him. A disclosure statement of the petitioner-Suresh was recorded, as per which he

had further transferred the account to Faizan and Arjun whom he had met in Jodhpur. The said Faizan and Arjun have not been arrested so far.

5. It is further pointed out that apart from the above, a sum of Rs.9.99 lacs had also been transferred to the account of one Mohd. Sarik Ali. His disclosure statement was recorded, wherein, he stated that he had given his account to Mohd. Sameer (petitioner in CRM-M-71112-2025) who was thereafter arrested on 27.08.2025. A sum of Rs.9,000/- was recovered from the house of Mohd. Sameer. A disclosure statement of Mohd. Sameer was recorded, wherein he stated that he had further sold the account to Vishal, who has yet not been arrested.

6. It is further informed that of the total duped amount from complainant-Vibha Singh, a sum of Rs.20,00,000/- had been transferred to the account of one Samir Shekh. His disclosure statement was recorded, as per which a sum of Rs. 4,00,000/- out of the aforesaid Rs.20,00,000/- was transferred to the account of one Balwinder Singh resident of Barnala. Upon his disclosure he informed that the said account has been further sold by him to Gursewak Singh @ Sunny (petitioner in CRM-M-61043-2025). The said petitioner was thereafter arrested on 16.07.2025 and a sum of Rs.1,000/- was recovered from him. Disclosure of the petitioner-Gursewak Singh @ Sunny was recorded, wherein he informed that the account had been further sold to one Amandeep Singh, who was also arrested (non-applicant). It was informed by Amandeep Singh that he further sold the account to one Sandeep Singh, who has not been arrested so far.

7. A sum of Rs.28.50 lakhs approximately was transferred to the account of M/s Jai Hanuman Engineering, which was under the proprietorship

of A.A. Ramakrishna resident of Andhra Pradesh. His disclosure was recorded wherein he stated that he had transferred a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the account of one Manjeet (petitioner in CRM-M-40884-2025). The said Manjeet was joined in investigation and he informed that he had given the account to Keshav Parkash (petitioner in CRM-M-68333-2025). Both the petitioners were arrested and taken in custody. However, on account of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***'Arnesh Kumar vs State of Bihar and Another'*** reported as **2014 (8) SCC 273**, they were released on bail. Eventually, a chargesheet was filed whereafter Keshav Parkash was rearrested. Petitioner-Manjeet Singh filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the Trial Court, however, the same was declined, thus resulting in filing of CRM-M-40884-2025 for grant of anticipatory bail. Counsel contends that Keshav Parkash was arrested on 03.09.2025 and as per his disclosure, he had transferred/sold the account to one Naveen who has yet not been arrested.

8. Counsel contend that the petitioners are thus secondary level moles who had only sold the accounts and that they did not participate in managing the fraud and it was on account of their own greed that they facilitated the commission of the said fraud. They cannot be said to be co-conspirators or those sharing the proceeds of the crime. They were also not aware of the network given their socio-economic circumstances. They further submit that the petitioners have already undergone actual custody ranging from 06 months to more than a year in the present case and that the trial is magisterial. The investigation qua the petitioners in the case is complete. The final report already stands filed. The custodial detention of the petitioners is not

likely to further any interest of justice. There are total 33 witnesses cited by the prosecution but none has been examined so far.

9. Learned State Counsel as well as counsel for the complainant do not dispute the facts noticed above. They however contend that had it not been on account of the petitioners providing their accounts, the fraud could not have fructified. They thus contend that the bail ought not be granted to the petitioners.

10. I have heard counsel for the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petitions.

CRM-M-34266-2025: CRM-M-61043-2025; CRM-M-68333-2025 & CRM-M-71112-2025

11. Taking into consideration the facts noticed above, the period of custody undergone by the petitioners which varies from 6 months to 01 year respectively in a magisterial trial and considering the stage of trial, where no witness has been examined so far, the socio-economic circumstances/conditions of the petitioners under which they might have facilitated commission of the offence as well as their clean antecedents, 1 deem it appropriate to allow the present petitions.

12. The instant petitions are allowed and the petitioners ie. Suresh (petitioner in CRM-M-34266-2025); Gursewak Singh @ Sunny (petitioner in CRM-M-61043-2025); Keshav Parkash (petitioner in CRM-M-68333-2025) and Mohd. Sameer (petitioner in CRM-M-71112-2025) are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

137 (05 cases) CRM-M-34266-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-40884-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-61043-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-68333-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-71112-2025 (O&M)

13. It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

14. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

CRM-M-40884-2025

15. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner-Manjeet Singh is directed to appear before the Trial Court, whereupon the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court, subject to the conditions as under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) of 2023.

16. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

18.03.2026 **(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**
Sumit Gusain **JUDGE**

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