



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

138

CRM-M-69511-2025

Date of decision: 24.02.2026

JAGDISH SINGH @ JAGDISH @ JK

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail, which is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.03 dated 08.04.2025. The above-mentioned case is for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 111 & 316(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66(D), Information Technology Act, 2000, Police Station Cyber Crime, District Rupnagar.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Lokesh Goyal' hereinafter being



referred to as complainant only. It was alleged by the above-named complainant that he was cheated to the tune of Rs.30,65,000/- after being induced by an unknown person operating a Telegram account in the name of Deepak Chopra (User ID @Chopra11882). During investigation three persons namely Raju Singh, Ram Swaroop (bank clerk) and Jagdish Singh @ JK (petitioner herein) were nominated. It was found that an amount of Rs.9,80,000/- out of the alleged cheated amount was credited on 06.12.2024 in a Punjab National bank account, belonging to Raju Singh. Out of the said amount, Rs.6,00,000/- was withdrawn through self-cheque and the remaining amount was withdrawn through ATM transactions. It has been further alleged that co-accused Ram Swaroop had facilitated the opening of the aforesaid bank account in the name of Raju Singh. The role attributed to the petitioner is that he allegedly delivered the cheque book and ATM card of Raju Singh to co-accused Ram Swaroop and, in lieu thereof, received an amount of Rs.4,000/- through online transfer in his bank account.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above-mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged, and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation the petitioner was taken into custody.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, the service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State counsel has filed custody certificate. The same be taken on record.



6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is innocent, having no nexus, whatsoever with the commission of crime. According to learned counsel for the petitioner in the present case the falsity of the allegations of the prosecution, against the petitioner, can be judged from the fact that the no money trail, with regard to proceeds of crime leads to the petitioner. As per learned counsel for the petitioner the only allegation against the petitioner are that he was instrumental in providing the ATM card and passbook etc. of Raju Singh to the main accused Ram Swaroop. While claiming that the entire prosecution case qua the petitioner is resting upon a disclosure statement of the co-accused, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no legally admissible evidence against the petitioner.

8. In addition to above, it has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that otherwise also the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate and the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of almost six months, and that the petitioner has clean record. According to learned counsel for the petitioner in view of cumulative effect of all the above-mentioned factors, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in the present case there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner with regard to his involvement in the commission of crime, and that the petitioner has played pivotal role in the commission of crime. As per learned State counsel in the present case the account of Raju Singh has been used for siphoning-off money



from the account of complainant, and that the ATM card and passbook of Raju Singh were made available to co-accused Ram Swaroop by the petitioner. It has also been stated by learned State counsel that for the above-mentioned act of the petitioner, he was paid by Ram Swaroop, and therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of petitioner that he has no link, whatsoever, with the commission of crime.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision: -

- i) that the present case pertains to an incident of Cyber crime;
- ii) that the kind of offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner and his co-accused has a very deep impact on the safety and security of financial transactions in the country particularly online transactions;
- iii) that *prima facie* the nexus between the commission of crime and the petitioner is established from the fact that money was received in his account and there is a disclosure statement of co-accused to this effect. The recovery of above-mentioned passbooks and ATM Card, coupled with transaction of money, supports the claim of the prosecution.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-mentioned factors, it is hereby observed that in the present case in view of gravity of offence and the link between the offence and the petitioner, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition is devoid of merits.



Hence, the same is hereby **dismissed** accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.02.2026

vipin

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