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

2026:PHHC:032784

115 (2 cases)

1. CRM-M-73410-2025 (O&M)

Saurabh Nivruti Sinde **... Petitioner**

versus

State of Punjab **... Respondent**

2. CRM-M-73411-2025 (O&M)

Mayank Santosh Jadhav **... Petitioner**

versus

State of Punjab **... Respondent**

Date of decision : 27.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Abhishek Chha, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

****

Manisha Batra, J. (*Oral*)

1. This common order shall dispose of abovementioned two petitions as they arise out of the same FIR and seek similar relied.

2. The instant petitions have been filed by the petitioners seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.23, dated 06.06.2025, registered under Sections 61(2), 318(4) and 319(2) of the BNS, 2023 at Police Station Cyber Crime Police Station Patiala, District Patiala.

3. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by complainant - Manjit Singh, alleging that he along with his son Amaybir Singh was made a victim of cyber crime by being induced through social media account on WhatsApp to invest his money and to gain handsome profits. He and his son had deposited an amount of Rs.88,00,051/- through different transactions that took place during the period from 05.05.2025 till 28.05.2025. Their money was transferred to different bank accounts and when he asked for return of the same, he was told to invest more money. Realizing that he had been cheated, complainant prayed for taking action in the matter.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that the money was got transferred by the complainant in 11 different bank accounts provided by the fraudsters. The amount of Rs.30 lakhs was deposited in a particular bank account operative in the name of one S.S. Enterprises owned by Amita Ajay Kumar Mishra. The mobile number registered with the said bank account was found to be issued in the name of accused Ajay Kumar Mishra. It was also revealed that the said bank account was also used by him. He was nominated as an accused and was arrested on 19.06.2023. On interrogation, he disclosed that he had opened the abovesaid bank account in the name of his wife at the instance of the co-accused Shrikant Arvind Kulkarni and Kishor Gulabrao and they had later sent him to Mumbai to meet two persons, namely, Rishi and Munna. The aforesaid persons were nominated as accused and subsequently arrested by the police. During further investigation, it was revealed that an amount of Rs.6 lakhs was transferred from the account of the complainant to an account opened in IDFC Bank, which was found to be registered in the name of petitioner Mayank

Santosh Jadhav. He was nominated in this case as accused and was arrested on 21.06.2025. Upon interrogation, he disclosed that he had opened and provided details of the said bank account to the co-accused for transferring money received fraudulently received from the complainant on the instructions of petitioner Saurabh Nivruti Sinde, who was also nominated as accused and arrested on the same day i.e. 21.06.2025. It was also found that the mobile phone of petitioner Saurabh was used to operate the account of Mayank Santosh Jadhav. Investigation qua the petitioners stands concluded.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. They were neither named in the FIR not had met the complainant or his son at any point of time. There is no allegation that they had induced the victim in any manner whatsoever to invest money. In fact, an amount of Rs.6 lakhs had been transferred to the account of petitioner Mayank Santosh Jadhav by misusing the details of his account. The case is based on documentary evidence. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not at all attracted qua them. They have clean antecedents. They have permanent abodes and there are no chances of their absconding, if extended benefit of bail. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by keeping them in custody anymore. It is, thus, stressed that they deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioners, who were actively involved in the cyber fraud racket. During investigation, it has specifically surfaced that Rs.6 lakhs out of the cheated amount was transferred into the bank account of petitioner Mayank Santosh Jadhav, which account was opened and

operated for the purpose of routing fraud proceeds. On interrogation, he disclosed that the said account details were knowingly provided to co-accused on the instructions of petitioner Saurabh Nivruti Sinde, thereby establishing their conscious and deliberate role in the commission of offence. It is further submitted that the petitioners are the key facilitators who provided banking infrastructure to the fraudsters, without which the offence could not have been executed. The fact that they were not named in the FIR is inconsequential as their roles have emerged during investigation. There are chances of their absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petitions do not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

8. The petitioners are alleged to have joined the cyber fraudsters, who induced the complainant and his son to part with huge amount of money, by arranging mule accounts, which could be used for the purpose of transfer of money received by way of fraud and further transfer of the same to other persons involved in the crime. The allegations against the petitioners are specific and supported by the investigation. It has surfaced that a part of the cheated amount, i.e. Rs.6 lakhs, was transferred into the bank account of petitioner Mayank Santosh Jadhav, which account was opened and used for routing proceeds of crime. Further, material on record shows that the said account was operated using the mobile phone of petitioner Saurabh Nivruti Sinde and that the account details were knowingly shared with co-accused, clearly indicating their active and conscious participation in the offence. The plea that the petitioners were not named in the FIR or that the amount was transferred by misusing account details does not inspire confidence at this stage, particularly when their roles have

clearly emerged during investigation. The offence in question is not an isolated act but part of an organized cyber fraud, wherein providing banking channels forms a crucial link in execution of the crime. Cyber crimes are steadily increasing and have a deep-rooted impact on society, targeting unsuspecting citizens and eroding public confidence in digital platforms. Such offences are serious economic crimes, affecting not only the victim but the financial system at large and, therefore, require a strict approach at the stage of bail. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the manner in which the offences were committed, the part played by the petitioners and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners do not deserve to be released on bail, at this stage. Accordingly, both the petitions are dismissed.

9. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petitions and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Let a photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

27.02.2026
Waseem Ansari

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