2026:PHHC:010557

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

**CRM-M-64173-2025 (O&M)**

**Chhuttan Meena ... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana ... Respondent**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | The date when the judgment is reserved | 22.01.2026 |
| 2. | The date when the judgment is pronounced | 28.01.2026 |
| 3. | The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website | 28.01.2026 |
| 4. | Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the 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. Nitin Bhanwala, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunny Namdev, AAG, Haryana.

***

**MANISHA BATRA, J.**

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner is seeking grant of regular bail to him in case arising out of FIR No. 106 dated 18.11.2024, registered under Section 318(4) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Cyber Police Station Cyber Cell, District Jind.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant Mukesh Kumar alleging that on 09.11.2024, he received a call from mobile number 6591029740

offering payment for posting hotel reviews on Google on behalf of one Geots Pvt. Ltd. The complainant was registered and added to a Telegram group. On 10.11.2024, after completing five hotel review tasks, he received a sum of Rs. 200/-. Thereafter, he was asked to deposit money in stages to receive higher returns. He deposited Rs. 1,000/- and received Rs. 1,500/-; then deposited Rs. 3,000/- on 11.11.2024 and received Rs. 4,600/-; and deposited Rs. 7,000/- on 11.11.2024, after which the accused claimed a technical error and demanded further deposits. Subsequently, the complainant was induced to deposit Rs. 29,600/- on the assurance of receiving Rs. 45,000/-. He was then informed of additional tasks and was made to deposit Rs. 1,28,500 in three instalments. Thereafter, he was further induced to deposit Rs. 2,58,600- in five instalments on the assurance of receiving a total amount of Rs. 6,34,000. The Telegram group contained five members, including one purported company representative and four alleged customers, who also shared screenshots of similar payments. After these transactions, the complainant was provided with a withdrawal link and was initially allowed to withdraw Rs. 6,000/- to gain confidence. However, when he attempted to withdraw the remaining amount, the transaction failed and he was informed that his account had been frozen due to a technical error and that he must deposit an additional amount of Rs. 6,34,600/- to unfreeze the account. Upon refusal, the complainant realized that he had been cheated. In total, wrongful loss of money amounting to Rs. 4,27,700/- was caused to the complainant, thereby cheating him. The complainant, thus, prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, details of certain bank accounts were

obtained, wherein the money taken by the complainant was further transferred. It was revealed that an amount of Rs.90,000/-, out of the total amount of money fraudulently taken from the complainant, was transferred into the bank account bearing No. 5672155817, opened in the name of the present petitioner. As such, the petitioner was nominated as an accused in this case and was arrested on 21.08.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject crime and disclosed that he had come into contact with co-accused Sitaram and joined him for committing cyber frauds and that he had provided his ATM Car, mobile sim linked with his bank account to co-accused Sitaram. He also admitted that he had received different amounts in this bank account, which was fraudulently taken from the complainant. The petitioner got recovered an amount of Rs.10,000/-. Co-accused Sitaram is still at large. Investigation qua the petitioner stands completed and challan has been filed on 09.10.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, co-accused Sitaram was his friend and it was on his request that he allowed the deposit of amount in his bank account. He was not aware at all that the said amounts were proceeds of cyber crime. He had neither withdrawn nor misused the aforesaid amount deposited in his account and he was under a bonafide belief that he would return the same to Sitaram. On coming to know about the real facts, the petitioner even offered to return the amount of the said money to the complainant but he refused to accept the same. His account has been frozen and the learned trial Court has directed the bank concerned to transfer the said amount of money to the complainant. The petitioner is in custody 21.08.2025. The complainant stands examined. The prolonged

period of his incarceration has entitled him to get bail. He is not required for further investigation. His continued detention would not serve any fruitful purpose. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. He has clean antecedents. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail and the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report and the custody certificate of the petitioner have been filed by the respondent-State. In terms of the same, learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is not entitled to get benefit of bail as there are serious allegations against him. He had provided his bank account to co-accused Sitaram, which was used for transferring amounts of money received by way of cyber frauds from the complainant. As per the bank statement, he had received a sum of Rs.90,000/- in his bank account. Co-accused Sitaram is yet to be arrested. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing similar offences, if released on bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

7. As per the allegations, the petitioner has provided his bank account to co-accused Sitaram for the purpose of receiving money taken from the cybercrime victims. He is even alleged to have received an amount of Rs. 90,000/- in his bank account which was fraudulently got transferred from the bank account of the complainant. A perusal of the statement of his bank account shows that he had withdrawn the said amount from his bank account on the same date. Hence, his plea that he never withdrew that amount stands falsified. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. In connivance with the co-accused, he is alleged to have duped the complainant of a sum of Rs.4,27,700/-. His

active participation in the commission of subject offences is prima facie reflected from the perusal of the status report. Crimes of this nature are on the rise and have become a growing menace in today's digital age. Cyber criminals are using sophisticated methods to target public persons and institutions. A stringent approach to deter offenders is required. Keeping in view the gravity of allegations so levelled against him, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

**(MANISHA BATRA)**
**28.01.2026** **JUDGE**
*Waseem Ansari*

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