



\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% **Date of Decision: 15th May, 2026**
+ BAIL APPLN. 3475/2025&CRL.M.(BAIL) 1898/2025
ADITYA SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Suresh Chadra Sati, Mr. Satish Chand, Mr. Vinod Kumar, Mr. Siddharth Sati, Ms. Priyanka Kumari, Ms. Shweta, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP.
Mr. Sunil Chaudhary, Mr. Praveen Singh, Mr. Siddharth Saroha, Advocates for complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR no. 18/2025 dated 28.01.2025 registered at PS Special Cell for commission of offence under Section 204, 308(2), 319, 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 338, 61(2) of BNS (corresponding Sections 170/384/416/419/420/468/471/467/120B IPC).
2. Present case pertains to *digital arrest* whereby the complainant has been cheated of Rs. 53.55 lacs. Some unscrupulous persons by impersonating as officials of *Law and Enforcement Agencies* duped her.
3. The cheated amount was transferred to various bank accounts. Substantial amount landed in one bank account of *Durgesham Plate (OPC) Private Limited* situated at Yes Bank, Patna.
4. The abovesaid bank account had been, allegedly, opened in a fraudulent manner for purposes of siphoning off the cheated money.
5. The actual account-holder of the abovesaid bank account is at large and



has already been declared “*proclaimed offender*”.

6. However, on account of the surveillance based on the mobile number and email id registered with the abovesaid bank account, the police, eventually, reached co-accused Bipen Kumar and arrested him. He has already been released on bail, *albeit*, after spending around one year behind the bars. His mobile phone was also taken into possession and when the mobile details were analyzed, the police were able to infer the complicity of the applicant herein i.e. Aditya Singh as there was regular and active communication between the two.

7. According to prosecution, the applicant herein was responsible for arranging *mule* bank accounts for use in such cyber-fraud activities and was also sharing and sending malicious APK files through *WhatsApp/Telegram*s for installation on targeted mobile phones for enabling auto-forwarding of OTPs and other transactional alerts.

8. Undoubtedly, on one earlier occasion, learned Predecessor Bench had granted interim protection to the applicant and he was directed to join the investigation but as per the report submitted on record, he has not assisted the investigation in the desired manner as the interrogation was found to be evasive in nature. He denied all the *WhatsApp* communication, despite there being technical evidence to the contrary. He also did not give the requisite details of the devices used by him.

9. During course of the arguments, learned APP for the state submitted that from the abovesaid bank account, substantial amount of Rs. 25,00,000/- was withdrawn by cash and it is suspected that there is involvement of the applicant also in the abovesaid withdrawal.

10. Therefore, it seems that the custodial interrogation would be imperative



and in order to protect the interest of the state and the complainant and also to unearth the conspiracy in question, this Court does not find any compelling reason to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

11. The protection given to him, earlier, is hereby withdrawn and the application is dismissed.

12. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that he would advise his client to surrender within one week. Needless to state, applicant is always at liberty to do so.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 15, 2026/sw/pb