



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

113

CRM-M-55812-2025 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 10.04.2026.

Ritik Choudhary @ Hritik Chaudhary

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Kanwar Abhay Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Ritik Choudhary @ Hritik Chaudhary, aged 28 years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.178 dated 29.06.2024 under Sections 419, 420 IPC (Sections 120 IPC and 66D of I.T. Act, 2000 added later on), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime West, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, on 13.10.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“1. xxx

2. In the present case, total duped amount is Rs. 1.17 crore, out of which an amount of Rs. 27,00,000/- was transferred into A.U. Small Finance Bank Account No. 2302251452588730. The said account was found to be in the name of M/s Aabhar Enterprises, which is stated to be a proprietorship concern of the

present petitioner – Rithik Choudhary @ Hrithik Chaudhary.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that, in fact, the said account was opened by the petitioner on the asking of his friend, namely, Ajay Rathore, and the whole money has been withdrawn by said Ajay Rathore.*

4. *Such a plea is very hard to accept at this juncture, which at best could be defence version of the petitioner at the relevant stage of the trial.*

5. *Adjourned to 15.12.2025.*

6. *Meanwhile, learned State counsel is directed to file the status report in regard to the investigation and also by giving the details about the educational qualifications of the petitioner. It be also explained as and when the aforementioned M/s Aabhar Enterprises came into being and for what particular purpose.”*

3. Detailed and exhausted status report dated 12.12.2025 has already been filed by the respondent-State and the same is there on record. Though considering the disclosure statements of the other accused persons, in the status report, it has been suggested that on asking of the friend, bank account was opened by the petitioner. Yet going through ongoing problem in the country with which the depositors are the sole victimized persons, who throughout are apprehensive of their amount being unsafe despite it lying in the respective bank accounts, I do not apply the principle of leniency or entitled to the discretionary relief of releasing such accused on bail.

4. With the prevailing circumstances, bank account holders are seriously developing a sense of insecurity regarding their hard-earned money deposited in the banks. The emerging trend of cybercrimes, as reflected in the present case, requires strict scrutiny and the application of strong deterrent principles.

5. It is particularly necessary to adopt such an approach because there exists no immediate statutory mechanism to provide prompt relief to an account holder who urgently requires the amount deposited in his bank account after being defrauded. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the amount, which is undisputedly found to have been deposited/ credited/ transferred into the bank account of the accused seeking bail should either be refunded to the complainant-victim or, at the very least, deposited before the Court in the form of an FDR along with accrued interest, so that the grievance of the complainant is redressed without undue delay.

6. This Court expresses concern especially for the reason that the defrauded amount may never be recovered by the complainant, and the conclusion of the criminal trial/case may take several years, or even a decade. Even in the event of conviction, it may not provide real or immediate relief to the victim.

7. In the interest of protecting citizens and securing the safety of funds deposited in banks, amounts which are often misused when account holders share their details with individuals involved in cybercrime, this Court is of the view that a stringent approach is warranted.

8. This Court does not find any special reason to extend discretionary relief to the petitioner at this stage, particularly while balancing the considerations of personal liberty with the larger societal interest. This view is supported by the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in '***Serious Fraud Investigation Office v. Aditya Sarda***', 2025 INSC 477, wherein it has been reiterated that economic offences constitute a class apart and must be dealt with a stringent approach at the stage of bail. The Hon'ble Apex Court observed that grant of bail in serious financial fraud cases should be

considered with greater caution, keeping in view the gravity of the offence, its impact on society, and the larger public interest.

9. In view of the above, present petition stands dismissed.

10. However, it will be open for the petitioner to file petition again once the defrauded amount which lended in his account through cyber fraud is returned or assured to be returned back to the account of the complainant/ victim.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

10.04.2026
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No