$~105

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 1628/2026, CRL.M.As. 13164-13165/2026

NARESH ALLEPALLY .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Y Lokesh, Mr. Ajay Kumar Shrivastava, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF GNCT OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP with SI Raj Kumar Singh.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

O R D E R

% 28.04.2026

1. By way of this application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"], the applicant seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 115/2024 dated 02.12.2024, registered at Cyber Police Station, District South, Delhi, under Section 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. I have heard Mr. Y. Lokesh, learned counsel for the applicant, and Mr. Tarang Srivastava, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The allegation in the FIR concerns a case of digital arrest. The complainant, who is approximately 70 years of age, filed an online complaint stating that he was induced to send a sum of Rs. 36,25,000/- to unknown persons upon receiving a call that a parcel was booked through DHL Courier using his credit card, which was found to contain

contraband/drugs and human organs. The complainant alleged that upon receiving the aforesaid call, he transmitted an aggregate of Rs. 36,25,000/- to various bank accounts specified by the caller. These included the sum of Rs. 23,21,899/- transmitted to an account with Bank of Maharashtra bearing No. 60511349001, which was in the name of one Komari Roja. The aforesaid account holder joined the investigation, wherein she disclosed that the applicant was a co-worker of her sister-in-law, and that he had induced her to open a bank account and supply the details to him for a consideration of Rs. 5,000/-. She also disclosed that the bank documents, including ATM card and passbook, were handed over by her to the applicant.

4. The applicant was called by Ms. Komari Roja to the Police Station, wherein he was served a notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS. In the course of interrogation, it is alleged that he disclosed that he arranged bank accounts for share market trade at the instance of a person nicknamed Lucky. The allegation of the prosecution is that WhatsApp chats between the applicant and Lucky have revealed forwarding of OTPs and facilitating changes in internet banking credentials. An amount of Rs.80,000 was also credited in the applicant's bank account bearing No. 10086874180 at IDFC Bank, towards supply of four bank accounts. Further, the cheque book, passbook, and ATM card of the Bank of Maharashtra account into which the complainant's funds were transferred, were recovered from the possession of the present applicant.

5. In support of the present application, Mr. Lokesh submits that the investigation has been completed and the chargesheet has been filed. In the meanwhile, the applicant has been in custody for a period of

approximately ten months. It is submitted that the applicant provided the aforesaid bank accounts to Lucky in the belief that they were to be used for legitimate share market transactions, without any knowledge that they would be used for digital arrests or cyber fraud crimes.

6. Mr. Srivastava, however, submits that the applicant's involvement in the serious offence is established both on the basis of the disclosure statements of the co-accused, corroborated by the recoveries from him, and financial transactions.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that this is not an appropriate case for grant of bail. The seriousness of digital arrest cases, in which vulnerable victims, including senior citizens, cannot be overemphasized. The *prima facie* material against the applicant includes the disclosure statement of co-accused Komari Roja, who was found to be the holder of the Layer 1 Bank Account, into which a substantial portion of the complainant's funds were transferred. The bank documents relating to the aforesaid account were recovered from the applicant, lending corroboration to the allegation that, at the very least, he had procured the mule accounts. The period of custody at present is also not such as to require release of the applicant on account of prolonged incarceration.

8. Having regard to the *prima facie* case demonstrating the applicant's involvement in the serious offence of digital arrest and cyber fraud, I am not inclined to release him on bail at this stage.

9. The bail application, alongwith pending applications, is disposed of.

10. It is clarified that the observations made herein are solely for the

purpose of adjudication of the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, nor shall they prejudice the rights and contentions of the parties at any stage of the proceedings.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 28, 2026
tg/KA/