



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

107

CRM-M No.41190 of 2025

Date of decision : 31.07.2025

Dharmendra Bhadana

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL****Present:-** Mr. Ankit Yadav, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.90 dated 25.03.2025 under Sections 318(4) of BNS (during investigation Section 62(2) BNS was added) registered at Police Station Cyber Crime NIT, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that an amount of Rs.13.07 lakhs was deducted from the Bank account of the complainant. Thereafter, one Rocky and Mukesh were arrested and on disclosure statement of Rocky, the name of the petitioner has surfaced. However, in the said disclosure statement it is stated that the complainant was friend of his father and he stole the mobile phone of the complainant and gave it to his co-accused who then by using the UPI interface, committed the fraud upon the complainant by way of transfer of money to another account(s).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has



not been named in the FIR and he has been nominated only on the basis of a disclosure statement.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the allegations made against the petitioner are grave in nature and states that the petitioner is involved in committing fraud upon the complainant and thus, prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the petitioner. In the present, the petitioner along with co-accused has cheated the complainant by way of transfer of an amount of Rs.13,07,000/- to bank accounts and as such, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. In view of above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 31, 2025**  
*Sonia Puri*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No