$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ BAIL APPLN. 536/2026

RAMAN KUMAR .....Applicant

Through: Mr. Gurbaksh Singh, Ms. Manjeet Kaur and Mr. Arjun Dhamija, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, APP for the State with Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh, Advocate
SI Ashish Kumar, PS-Cyber South.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

<u>O R D E R</u>

% 08.04.2026

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 482* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.79/2025 dated 20.11.2025 registered at PS.: Cyber (South), Delhi under *Section 112(2)/317(2)161(2)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (***BNS***).

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is a first-time offender and is not even named in the FIR. So much so, the applicant is unaware of the practice followed by the persons engaging in cyber fraud. As per learned counsel for the applicant, the applicant has already joined investigation, and is further willing to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. Hence, it is prayed that anticipatory bail be granted to the applicant.

3. *Per contra*, the learned APP submits that the applicant is the

mastermind, who has not only been holding different bank accounts, but as per the statement of Mr. Kuldeep (***independent witness***), he is also asking different person(s) for their respective bank accounts on one pretext or the other. For this, learned APP relies on the assertions made in the Status Report, which are reproduced herein as under:-

> "*E. That thereafter, efforts were made to trace the applicant Raman; however, he was not found at his known address. Consequently, notice under Section 35.5 BNSS dated 10.12.25 was again pasted outside his residence directing him to join investigation but he did not join investigation in present case. Thereafter alleged Raman moved an anticipatory bail in Ld. ASJ court and the vide order dated 08.01.2026 Ld. ASJ court gave interim protection to Raman and directed him to join investigation in present case. Thereafter alleged Raman joined investigation in present case on 17.01.26 in PS and he was interrogated in present case but he gave evasive reply and did not co-operate in the investigation. Thereafter the anticipatory bail application of alleged Raman was dismissed by Ld. ASJ Court vide order dated 21.01.2026. Thereafter efforts were made to trace him but he evaded investigation in present case.*
>
> *F. That it is pertinent to mention that during investigation, it was also revealed that bank accounts held by the applicant Raman are themselves reported on the NCRP portal, the details of which are as follows*:

S No.	Bank Name	Account Number	No. of Time Report on NCRP	NCRP Acknowledgment Number (s)	Nature of Complaint	Layer
1	Jio Payments Bank	000920411008713	01 Time	23112240125124	Job Fraud	3rd
2	Kotak Mahindra Bank	7112712210	02 Times	3711210263789, 31103230031401	Job Fraud	1st

The applicant Raman was questioned regarding the above complaints when he joined investigation in Police Station however, he falsely claimed that the said transactions were related to online gaming activities. Upon verification of the concerned complaints, the transactions were found to be related to job fraud cases.

G. That during further investigation, one person namely Kuldeep, resident of Sangam Vihar, gave his statement under Section 180 BNSS, wherein he stated that the applicant Raman had taken his bank account QR code on the pretext of receiving salary, deposited money into his account and thereafter took the amount from him partly in cash and partly through bank transfer into his own account. The witness further stated that he later came to know that the said money was cheating proceeds due to which his bank account was reported on the NCRP portal. He also stated that Raman had taken bank accounts from others also and was involved in cheating activities.

H. That alleged Raman was granted interim protection by this Hon'ble court vide order dated 06/02/2026 and after that alleged Raman was again made to join investigation in present case and was again interrogated regarding the allegations against him and his reported accounts but alleged Raman denied all the allegations."

4. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State as also perused the documents on record and the Status Report.

5. In the contemporary times, economic offences *via* internet, commonly referred to as *Cyber Fraud* have now become an outrage in the prevailing circumstances where such use across mediums are indeed a puzzling one, particularly, since they involve numerous transactions/ accounts/ entities/ persons/ actions in spanning through different timelines. Almost everything is in the Air and is unknown to almost everyone, including the prosecution, thus making it difficult for them to find a name

and a face. Since, in most cases there is hardly anything known and/ or available directly, it requires a lot of spadework from the prosecution. All these are enough for calling for custodial interrogation for ascertaining the actual chain of events for tracing and establishing the nexus, connection, involvement, a common intention and/ or meeting of minds *inter se* all those involved. In fact, the present is indeed such a case wherein the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required for more than one reason.

6. Moreover, all the above require this Court to be careful and cautious while granting anticipatory bail to the applicant herein. In fact, in ***Rakesh Mittal vs. Ajay Pal Gupta, alias Sonu Chaudhary & Anr: 2026 INSC 161***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that in economic offences where innocent people are cheated of their hard-earned monies by fraudsters, who deliberately prey upon the trust and vulnerability of others for unlawful gain, the Courts ought to deal with the same with a firm hand. Under such circumstances, it is too early for the applicant to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

7. Since the bank accounts involved in the present economic offences reflected in the NCRP Portal are under the name of the applicant herein, and since as per the statement of the independent witness, the applicant often goes around asking various people for their QR Codes/ bank account details to execute the cyber fraud, custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary, especially to unearth the cheated amounts as also the role of the people involved in executing and/ or participating in the present multilayered cyber fraud.

8. In view of the above, the present application is dismissed.

9. The observations expressed hereinabove, if any, being tentative in nature, will not come in the way of any subsequent proceedings, which shall be dealt on their own merits.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

APRIL 8, 2026/NA