

2026.PHHC.010556



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-67835-2025 (O&M)

Mohan Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	23.01.2026
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. Prince Jangra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, 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. 20 dated 27.09.2024, registered under Sections 238, 318(4) and 61(B) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNS'*) at Cyber Police Station, Narnaul, District Mahendergarh
2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant Sunil Kumar alleging therein

that he had been induced to part with a sum of Rs.1,18,47,353/- by way of cyber crime committed by the petitioner and the co-accused by being allured on the premise to invest money and to fetch profits. The money belonging to the complainant was shown to be transferred in the bank account operated by the co-accused Vinod Piplodiya and Sanjay Kumawat @ Sanju. The trail of the crime also led to co-accused Parmod Kumar, Abhishek Sharma, Mukesh Nath, Aman Dela and Kailash Nath who were apprehended on 28.12.2024 when all of them were indulged in committing online fraud by using cell phones and laptops in some premises.

3. As per further allegations, during the course of investigation, it was revealed that an amount of Rs.50,000/- was transferred from the bank account of the complainant to the bank account of the present petitioner on 04.09.2024. The petitioner was as such nominated as an accused in this case and was arrested on 23.11.2024. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involved in the subject crime and disclosed that his relative (co-accused) Brij Mohan had told him that he was in contact with one Anurag, who used to provide bank accounts to persons involved in cyber frauds and in return would get commission. He further told the petitioner that if he would also give his bank account to cyber fraudsters for the purpose of transfer of money, he would also be getting commission in lieu thereof. He had given three bank accounts to co-accused Anurag through co-accused Brij Mohan for using the same in cyber frauds. He further disclosed that co-accused Brij Mohan used to send him account numbers and UPI IDs through Whatsapp to transfer money and he used to send screenshots of money coming in and going out of his account to co-accused Brij Mohan. He also admitted to have received an amount of

Rs.50,000/- from the account of the complainant. Recoveries of several mobile phones, ATM cards, cheque books, passbooks and sim cards etc. were effected from the accused persons. The investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he is in custody for a period of over one year. The trial is delayed. 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. Co-accused Aman Dela, Parmod Kumar and Abhishek Shrama have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. On parity, the petitioner too deserves to be given the same benefit. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail and the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report has 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 bank accounts, opened in his name, to co-accused Anurag, which were used for transferring amounts of money received by way of cyber frauds. His case is on different footing than that of above named co-accused. 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 accounts to co-accused Anurag. He is even alleged to have received an

amount of Rs. 50,000/- in his bank account which was fraudulently got transferred from the bank account of the complainant. The bank accounts provided by the petitioner were further used for transferring amount of money received by the victims by way of committing cyber frauds. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. In connivance with the co-accused, he is alleged to have duped the complainant a sum of Rs.1,18,47,353/-. His active participation in the commission of subject offences is prima facie reflected from the perusal of the status report. His case cannot be stated to be at par with above named co-accused. 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.

28.01.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)

JUDGE

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