



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-52888 of 2025

Date of Decision: 17.02.2026

Rajesh Singh Bhadoria
... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab
... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition under Section(s) 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as “BNSS” only, has been moved for grant of bail with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 23 dated 12.09.2024 for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s)308(2), 318(4), 319(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as “BNS” [Sections 337 and 338 of BNS added later on] and Sections 66(C) and 66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, Police Station Punjab State Cyber Crime, District Crime Wing, District S.A.S. Nagar, Punjab.
2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of ‘Maninder Singh’ hereinafter being referred to as “complainant” only. It was stated by the complainant that on 08.09.2024 he had received a call and the

caller told him that a mobile number 6776413665 issued in his name was being used for illegal purposes, i.e. illegal advertisement and sending harassing text messages. According to complainant, the caller had transferred the call to Delhi Crime Branch and from there a person identifying himself as ‘ officer Arjun Singh’ talked to him and told that there were 17 complaints with regard to above mentioned mobile number, and that the above-mentioned number was being used for money laundering. According to complainant by threatening that the petitioner would have to face the FIR, the above named person got ₹2,45,000/- transferred in his account. According to complainant thereafter on the demand of above named officer ‘Arjun Singh’ he also transferred ₹21,68,000/- in account number 070605500069, ICICI Bank and with regard to above mentioned transaction even a receipt purported to have been issued by CBI was issued to him. The complainant further stated that he was assured that the money will return to this account within four/five hours, but later on he found that nothing came to his account and that he was subjected to fraud.

3. It is the case of prosecution that in view of above mentioned statement, the formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent having no nexus, whatsoever, with the commission of crime, and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the offence is triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate, and that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more

than seven months, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in fact the petitioner is a Truck Driver by profession, and that his employer had collected the documents such as 'Aadhar Card' and 'Bank Account document' from him and the above mentioned documents have been misused for the above said fraud.

6. Per contra the learned State counsel has come forward with the augment that a false plea has been taken by the petitioner. The learned State counsel, while referring to the contents of reply filed by the State, has pointed out that the petitioner was the sole perpetrator of firm 'Om Sai Bandhan Agency', and that the above-mentioned firm was having a current account and in the account of above-mentioned firm the money from the account of complainant was transferred. While claiming that the petitioner has a direct nexus with the commission of crime, the learned State counsel has sought for dismissal of present petition.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that in the present case there are very specific and categorical allegations that a sum of ₹21,68,000/- was transferred from the account of complainant to the account of petitioner and therefore, a direct nexus between the commission of crime and the petitioner stands established in the present case.

9. In addition to above, it is also relevant to mention here that the present case pertains to a case of digital arrest/Cybercrime and these kind of activities are having a very strong negative impact not only on the credibility of electronic transfer of money upon which the economy of the country is

presently based, but also causes a great impact on the financial security of banking transactions. Since there is direct nexus between the commission of crime and the petitioner, it is hereby held that at this stage, the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner is punishable with imprisonment upto seven years and therefore, it is grave enough to deny the benefit of bail to the petitioner.

10. As a sequel to above mentioned observations, it is hereby held that on account of direct nexus between the commission of crime and the petitioner, he is not held entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition filed by the petitioner being devoid of merits deserves dismissal. Hence, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

11. It is, however, made clear that any observation made here-in-above is only for the purpose of deciding the present appeal and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

February 17, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No