

2026.PHHC.009517



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-69040-2025 (O&M)

Brij Mohan ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	20.01.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.01.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.01.2026
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. Mayank Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, 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 Section 318(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNS'*) [Sections 61(b) and 238 of BNS added later on] 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 petitioners 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 Parmok Kumar and Abhishek Sharma who along with the co-accused Mukesh Nath and Kailash 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. Accused Mohan son of Ramkishan was joined into investigation on 23.12.2024.

3. As per further allegations, on interrogation, the petitioner suffered disclosure statement, on the basis of which, the present petitioner was nominated as additional accused and was arrested on 26.12.2024. He suffered disclosure statement to the effect that on asking of his friend Anurag, who had disclosed that he was engaged with a gang involved in committing cyber frauds and used to make bank accounts available to said fraudsters, he had joined said Anurag and had hatched a conspiracy that he would be facilitating providing of bank accounts of other persons to Anurag for the purpose of fraudulent transactions. He had even given 4-5 bank accounts, opened in his name, and 4-5 bank accounts, pertaining to his acquaintances, to co-accused Anurag, who had given commission to him in lieu thereof. He further disclosed that he had made accused Mohan to open an account and provide the same to him and the said bank account was also used for carrying out transactions of money received by the cyber frauds. 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 has 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 as well as opened by his acquaintances, 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 co-accused Aman Dela. 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 got opened some bank accounts by his acquaintances, which were also provided by him to co-accused Anurag. These bank accounts were allegedly 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 as well as disclosure statement of co-accused Mohan. His case cannot be stated to be at par with co-accused Aman Dela. 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.

23.01.2026
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No