

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

146

2026.PHHC.028174



CRM-M-70248-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.02.2026

Kailash Nath

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

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 in case arising out of FIR No.20 dated 27.09.2024, registered under Sections 318(4), 61(b) and 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Cyber Police Station, Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.
2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the 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 alluring him on the pretext of investing money to fetch huge profits. The money belonging to the complainant was transferred into the bank accounts operated by co-accused Vinod Piplodia and Sanji Kumawat @ Sanju. The trail of the crime also led to the present petitioner and co-accused Abhishek Sharma, Parmod Kumar, Aman

Dela and Mukesh Nath, who were apprehended on 28.12.2024, when all of them were found indulging in committing online fraud by using mobile phones and laptops at certain premises. Recoveries of several mobile phones, ATM cards, cheque books, passbooks, SIM cards, etc. were effected from them. The investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been in custody since 23.12.2024. The co-accused Parmod Kumar, Abhishek Sharma and Aman Dela, against whom similar allegations were levelled, have been extended the benefit of bail. On the grounds of parity, the petitioner also deserves to be given the same benefit. He does not have any criminal antecedents. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, in terms of the status report, has vehemently argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. There are chances of his committing similar offences or absconding if extended the benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner, along with the co-accused, is alleged to be part of a criminal conspiracy in pursuance of which the complainant was cheated and wrongful loss to the tune of a huge amount was caused to him. The call detail records, IMEI IDs of the cell phones used by these accused and recovered from the spot were collected and it was found that all of them were in conversation with each other as well as with the petitioner. The mobile phones and laptops, which were recovered from the possession of the petitioner and other co-

accused at the time of apprehending them, have been sent to DITAC Laboratory, Gurugram for analysis and the report thereof is still awaited. A perusal of the status report reveals that the petitioner was an active participant in the commission of alleged offences. He cannot be termed to be at par with the co-accused, who have been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Such cases are increasing at an alarming rate. Every day, one comes across instances where the hard-earned money of innocent citizens is siphoned off by organised groups of online fraudsters. Such offences not only cause financial loss to individual victims but also undermine public confidence in the security of digital transactions. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the case of the petitioner cannot be stated to be at parity with that of the co-accused who have been extended the benefit of bail. Considering the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the role attributed to him and the apprehension that he may abscond or influence the trial if extended the benefit of bail, which cannot be said to be unfounded at this stage, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail, at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. 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.

23.02.2026
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No