

2026:PHHC:048109



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58087-2025 (O&M)

Prakash Chaudhary
Versus
State of Haryana

...Petitioner
...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	25.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	30.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	30.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No. 264 dated 17.12.2024, registered under Sections 308(2), 318(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 351(4) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 [Sections 238 and 241 of BNS added later on] at Police Station Cyber Crime, Panipat.
2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant Mukesh Kumar Garg alleging that he received a phone call on 07.12.2024 at about 12:15 PM from mobile

2026:PHHC:048109



number 87094115474, wherein the caller falsely represented himself as an official from the Reserve Bank of India and informed that a credit card had been fraudulently issued in the name of the complainant using his documents, allegedly involving a fraud of Rs. 2 crores. On 08.12.2024 at about 10:09 PM, the complainant received a WhatsApp video call from mobile number 918543982626, wherein the caller impersonated as an officer of the Mumbai Police and claimed that the complainant was under “digital arrest” in connection with the said alleged fraud. The complainant was kept under continuous video surveillance for approximately 11 hours and 37 minutes. During this period, the accused persons threatened the complainant with dire consequences, including threats to his life and that of his family and demanded Rs.1 crore for avoiding arrest. They further sent a forged document bearing the National Emblem and purporting to be issued by the Mumbai Police to lend authenticity to their threats. Acting under fear and coercion, the complainant transferred a total sum of Rs.1,00,00,000/- (one crore rupees) in the following manner:

- Rs.65,00,000/- on 08.12.2024 via RTGS from his Indian Bank account to DBS Bank account No. 8858210000006514;
- Rs.23,00,000/- on 12.12.2024 via RTGS from his PNB account to IndusInd Bank account No. 259601615856;
- Rs.12,00,000/- on 16.12.2024 via RTGS to ICICI Bank account No. 186905001629.

3. As per the further allegations, during the period from 07.12.2024 to 16.12.2024, the complainant continued to receive WhatsApp video calls from numbers 918543982626 and 919057758801. The callers

2026:PHHC:048109



also impersonated officials of the Enforcement Directorate and repeatedly threatened arrest unless the demanded amounts were paid. The complainant later, upon consulting acquaintances, realized that he had been deceived and defrauded by unknown persons impersonating government officials. He reported the incident to the cyber helpline (1930) and registered an online complaint bearing No. 31312240068089. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

4. During the course of investigation, the relevant records of the bank account of the complainant and aforementioned three bank accounts were analyzed. The aforesaid bank account opened in DBS Bank was found to be opened in the name of one Mohit Kumar, who was joined into investigation. He disclosed that one Tipu Sultan, Bank Relation Manager of DBS Bank, Gurugram, had used his bank account for cyber fraud without his knowledge and by forging his signature on some documents and that he had already lodged an FIR bearing No. 374 dated 11.12.2024, under Section 318(4) of BNS and Section 66 of the I. T. Act at Police Station Cyber Crime, Gurugram against him. The accused Tipu Sultan was in custody in some other case and subsequently was arrested in the present case as well on 09.01.2025 by way of issuance of production warrants. Upon interrogation, he admitted his involvement in the subject crime and disclosed that he along with his associate Mohd. Mohsin Siddiqui had manipulated the records of the account belonging to abovenamed Mohit Kumar and had sold the bank account's credentials to co-accused Mohit Kumar Malu and the present petitioner and received money in lieu thereof. Subsequently, an amount of Rs.65,00,000/- duped from the complainant was transferred in this account.

2026:PHHC:048109



The co-accused Mohd. Mohsin Siddiqui and the petitioner were arrested on 12.01.2025 and 15.01.2025, respectively. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement. The petitioner disclosed that he was initially contacted through a Telegram ID (@Crypto777770), who offered him Rs. 10 lakhs in exchange for arranging a current bank account. He was further directed to contact two other Telegram IDs, namely **@souravbadmash** and **@sunny558555**. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner established contact with them and met them at Dwarka, Delhi, where he received an advance amount of Rs. 50,000/-. Subsequently, co-accused Mohd. Mohsin Siddiqui informed the petitioner that he had contacts with another co-accused, Tipu Sultan, who was working as a personal banker at DBS Bank and could facilitate the opening of a current account. In furtherance of the plan, the petitioner arranged for the creation of a second email ID in the name of Mohit Kumar and assisted in filling and submitting the account updation form through intermediaries. Thereafter, Tipu Sultan allegedly accessed bank records and shared account details with Mohd. Mohsin, which were ultimately forwarded to the petitioner. The petitioner then transmitted the credentials, including the user ID and password of the concerned DBS bank account, to the original contact on Telegram. The petitioner also got recovered a mobile phone in which a voice recording was found, wherein he was found to be talking with co-accused. On the basis of the call details record and money transferred to different accounts, several other persons were also nominated in this case as an accused. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been filed. The petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

2026:PHHC:048109



5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. He is not the beneficiary of any transaction in the bank account in question. has not been named, suspected or identified by the complainant. He has not received any amount in this bank account. No incriminating material has been recovered from the petitioner. He is in custody since long. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying him concession of bail in this case. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner along with co-accused, by impersonating officials of government agencies and using threats of “digital arrest”, has committed a grave and organized cyber fraud of huge amount of money with the complainant. The *modus operandi* reflects premeditation and involvement of a larger racket operating through multiple bank accounts and mobile numbers. The petitioner has actively participated in the subject crime. He is a habitual offender. He is involved in three other similar FIRs. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at

2026:PHHC:048109



considerable length.

8. The allegations show that the petitioner has actively facilitated the commission of the fraud. The investigation further revealed that an amount of Rs.65,00,000/-, out of the cheated sum, was credited into the said account. The petitioner is also stated to have been in contact with co-accused persons, as reflected from the mobile phone recovered from him containing incriminating voice recordings. His role, therefore, is not peripheral but forms an integral part of the mechanism through which the fraud was executed. Having considered the submissions and going through the material placed on record, this Court finds that the allegations disclose a well-planned and organized cyber fraud executed through impersonation of officials of reputed institutions and enforcement agencies, coupled with intimidation in the guise of “digital arrest”. The nature of accusations, the manner of execution and the magnitude of the amount involved indicate a deep-rooted conspiracy involving multiple actors and layered transactions. At this stage, the contention regarding inadmissibility of disclosure statements cannot be accepted as a ground for bail, particularly when there is other prima facie material connecting the petitioner with the offence. The recovery effected and the financial trail, as emerging from the investigation, lend support to the prosecution case. The antecedents of the petitioner also weigh against him, as he is stated to be involved in other similar cases and multiple cyber crime complaints, indicating a continuing pattern of such activities. The possibility of his indulging in similar offences or evading the process of law, if enlarged on bail, cannot be ruled out. Menace of cyber crimes is on rise these days, where innocent individuals are deceived through technologically

2026:PHHC:048109



advanced methods and psychological coercion, leading to substantial financial loss and erosion of trust in digital systems. Such offences have far-reaching societal impact and require a strict approach.

9. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the material collected during investigation and his antecedents, this Court does not find any ground to grant the concession of regular bail to him. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

10. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

30.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No