



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

CRM-M-8519-2025

Reserved on: 26th March, 2025

Pronounced on: 3rd April, 2025

Vinod Piplodiya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate and
Mr. Ranjan Lohan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 20 dated 27.09.2024 registered under Sections 318(4), 61(b) and 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Cyber Police Station, Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations, complainant Sunil Kumar had received a message through *Telegram App* installed in his cell phone, whereby offer had been made to do some work online. He had clicked a web link as per the instructions received in the message. A website in the name of Cars24 was opened. He was asked to register in the website. He had filled the requisite



information in the given format and was initially made to deposit a sum of Rs. 1015/-. The operators of the above named website, induced the complainant to deposit money on different account numbers as disclosed in the website, by alluring him to fetch profits. The complainant deposited a sum of Rs. 1,18,47,353/- through bank accounts of his wife and himself. An amount of Rs. 1,52,03,443/- was shown in the account of the website but he was unable to withdraw the said amount and thereafter, he realised that he had been made a victim of cyber crime.

3. On his complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. It was revealed that different amounts of money from the bank accounts of complainant and his wife were transferred in the bank accounts of accused Nikhil Bhardwaj, Nitesh Garg, Kishore Tomar, Mohan and the present petitioner. An amount of Rs. 80,000/- was transferred in the bank account of the petitioner on 10.10.2024 from the bank account of the complainant. The petitioner was arrested on 23.11.2024. He suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he was involved in the work of online fraud by co-accused Sanjay Kumawat @ Sanju, who too was arrested subsequently. The petitioner led the police party to HDFC ATM machine from where he had withdrawn money and got demarcated the same. The co-accused were also arrested subsequently. Investigation stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the allegations that an amount of Rs. 80,000/- was transferred from the bank account of the complainant in his



account. His role if any is marginal and does not warrant prolonged detention. Investigation stands completed. Trial would take time to conclude. No direct evidence qua his involvement has been reflected. He was not even named in the FIR. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. Accordingly, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. As per the report of Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre, his involvement is found not only in this case but in eight other cyber complaints. He was an active participant in the crime. There are chances of his fleeing, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

7. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. In connivance with the co-accused, he is alleged to have duped the complainant a sum of Rs. 1,18,47,353/-. His participation in the commission of subject offences is *prima facie* reflected from the allegations in the FIR. Mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when gravity of the offence alleged is serious. Keeping in view the serious nature of allegations so levelled against him, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without



meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

3rd April, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*