



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

**104**

**CRM-M No.28269 of 2025  
Date of decision: 22.05.2025**

Alpna Prakash

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

**Present:** Mr. Mandeep Singh Lamba, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter 'BNSS') for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.36 dated 09.12.2024 under Sections 308(2), 318(4), 319(2), 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Cyber Crime Police, District Ludhiana City.

2. Succinctly, the facts, as alleged, are that on 19.11.2024 at about 3:28 PM, the complainant Varinder Kumar received a telephonic call on his mobile No.6280079557 from mobile Nos. +85778150835 and +85739-13323, wherein the caller claimed to be a CBI employee and by inducing fear to him and his wife through a video call, managed to get Rs. 83,00,000/- transferred into their account. Upon inquiry, the account was found to be in the name of a firm, Source My Trip Private Limited, located at 54 Block L2A, Mohan Garden, New Delhi. When the account holder was contacted, he revealed that he had owned the firm in 2013, but due to losses during COVID-19, he sold it to Ranjit Kumar, Akash Singh Gaur, and petitioner of Uttar Pradesh for Rs.27,00,000/-. Although notices were issued to the said accused persons, they did not appear.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that although she purchased an interest in the said firm in 2023, she has neither operated nor managed its affairs due to personal constraints, including lack of technical expertise and her preoccupation with household responsibilities. It is further contended that her name was not mentioned in the original FIR(*supra*) and was subsequently added without any substantive or direct evidence linking her to the alleged cybercrime. Subsequently, no recovery is pending from her and she has no knowledge of, or involvement in, any financial transactions or fraudulent activities attributed to the firm. Reliance is placed on ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab (1980)***; ***Sushila Aggarwal v. State of NCT of Delhi, (2020) 5 SCC 1***; ***Parisha Trivedi v. State of Chhattisgarh (2024)***; ***Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI (2020)***

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record of the case with their able assistance.

5. The record reveals that a co-accused, posing as a CBI official on video call, induced the complainant, a retired army officer, to part with an amount of Rs.83,00,000/-. The said amount was transferred to the account of a firm where the petitioner is a partner. Although the petitioner claims to have played no active role in the management of the firm, the factum of her being a partner in the same, where the proceeds of the crime were received, cannot be ignored. In cases of cybercrime of such magnitude, where fear and impersonation are used as tools to deceive innocent individuals, particularly senior citizens and retired personnel, the threat posed to the society at large is serious and growing. Cybercrime is increasingly becoming a sophisticated tool for large-scale financial frauds. This growing menace, especially with the advent of artificial intelligence, aimed at exploiting the unsuspecting, calls for heightened judicial vigilance.

6. Adverting to the matter at hand, owing to the seriousness of the allegations and the larger societal impact of this menace of cyber fraud, this Court does not find any ground to grant the concession of



anticipatory bail to the petitioner as custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative for the jurisdictional police authorities to conduct a proper investigation.

7. In view of the discussion above, present petition is dismissed.

8. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits without being prejudiced by the observations of this Court.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

**22.05.2025**  
*yakub*

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No