



238

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

CRM-M-30654-2025

Date of Decision: 03.07.2025

MANDEEP KOHLI

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Lekh Raj Sharma, Advocate &
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.18 dated 10.02.2025, registered under Sections 66, 66-B, 72, 72-A of Information Technology (Amendment) Act 2008 & 318(4) of BNS 2023, Police Station Cyber Crime, District Yamunanagar.
2. Mr. Atul Tanwar, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant by filing his power of attorney, which is taken on record.
3. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Akash Mishra, authorized representative of Beom Cominerce Private Limited and the same has been reproduced below:-

“To SHO Cyber Crime Yamuna Nagar, Haryana: Respected Sir/Madam, We, BEOM COMMERCE Pvt. Ltd., an Indian subsidiary of Renske Technologies Inc. (USA) and Ravant



Technologies FZCO (Dubai), write to formally lodge a complaint against Mr. Mandeep, a former employee of our organization, who engaged in fraudulent activities resulting in the embezzlement of public funds and compromising the integrity of our operations.

Background of BEOM Commerce Pvt. Ltd: Beom Commerce Pvt. Ltd. is a software development and security operations centre operating in India with a team of 10 employees. The company recently transitioned from a remote operational model to a physical office to support new mobile application development initiatives. As part of its operations, the company facilitated a cryptocurrency-based Initial Coin Offering (ICO) platform that allowed users to purchase tokens securely through a well-structured backend system.

Summary of Fraudulent Activities by Mr. Mandeep: Unauthorised Diversion of Funds: Mr. Mandeep, hired as Tech Lead in October 2024, suggested transitioning our backend system's payment configuration to environment-based variables. Once implemented, he exploited this change by redirecting user payments from our authorised company wallet addresses to his personal cryptocurrency wallets. As per blockchain analysis, the amount invested by our Investors on our platform was diverted to unauthorised wallet addresses controlled by Mr. Mandeep in the form of Ethereum and BNB coin which is approximately around 8 Lacs in Indian rupees as calculated so far. These funds represent public money that we are now liable to refund to users.

2. Continued Fraudulent Activities: Domain Impersonation and Cloning: During his tenure, Mr. Mandeep registered the domain meladroom.je to impersonate our official project aurealone.com, and deceived users into interacting with fraudulent platforms. He replicated our project using stolen source code and backend systems. The domain meindroom.lo was registered on December 19, 2024.

b. Cloud Mare DNS Manipulation: Confrontation on January 13, 2024, and false promise to return the stolen funds, Mr. Mandeep exploited shared



credentials to gain unauthorised access to our Cloudflare DNS. On January 20, 2024, he maliciously redirected traffic from our legitimate domain (aurcalune.com) to the website (Gurcelone.com). This action misled potential buyers and caused reputational and financial harm. c. Misuse of Company Resources: Mr. Mandeep retains a company-issued laptop containing sensitive backend and frontend codes, including payment modules. He has used this access to maintain fraudulent platforms, further jeopardising our business integrity. Behavioural and Evidence-Based Misconduct: Admission of Fraud: During an office confrontation, Mr. Mandeep admitted to altering environmental variables for his personal benefit, justifying it as "testing." The admission was recorded in the presence of company officials. Communication Blockage: Post-confrontation, Mr. Mandeep blocked all communication channels including WhatsApp, effectively evading accountability. Threats and Manipulation: he falsely accused the company of harassment claimed coercion to travel for work, and used emotional blackmail including threats of self-harm to manipulate the situation. Evidence supporting the allegations: GitHub-detailed records of unauthorized changes to environment variables and fraudulent redeployments. 2. Blockchain Records: Payment traits showing diverted funds to unauthorized wallets, Deployment Logs: Portainer and AWS ECR logs confirming unauthorised redeployments. 4. Domain Registration Proof of the registration of fraudulent domains, including metadroon. io. 5. Audio Recording: A recorded admission by Mr. Mandeep acknowledging fraudulent actions. 6. Witness Statements: Testimonies from team members describing Mr. Mandeep's hostile behaviour and fraudulent practices. 7. CLOUDFARE Logs: evidence of unauthorized DNS Access and malicious redirection. Legal Appeal and Request: We humbly request your esteemed office to File 1. FIR against Mr. Mandeep under relevant sections for breach of trust, misappropriation of



funds, and cyber fraud. 2. Investigate unauthorized and diversion of funds 3. Seize the company-issued laptop retained by Mr. Mandeep to recover stolen intellectual property and sensitive data 4. Take swift action to prevent further fraudulent activities by Mr. Mandeep and S involves public funds, and BEOM Commerce Pvt. Ltd. is committed to refunding affected users. Your immediate intervention will help us recover the diverted funds and ensure justice is served. We are ready to provide all relevant documents and evidence to assist in your investigation. We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter. Yours sincerely, SD AKASH MISIIRA Akash Mishra Beom Cominerce Pvt. Ltd.”.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in fact a dispute had arisen between the petitioner and the complainant and as a result thereof, the present FIR has been got registered by the complainant. He further contends that it has been alleged that the petitioner had siphoned off 68 lakhs of rupees, however, the said allegation is incorrect. In fact there was a financial dispute between the parties and the petitioner had also returned a sum of Rs.26,00,000/- to the complainant. He further contends that in the present case, the complainant side had failed to establish the link between the devices owned/used by the petitioner and the alleged transactions. Even the sim card recovered from the petitioner after his arrest did not match with the contact numbers provided in the KYC, which have been recovered by the police from various banks. Thus, there is a possibility of impersonation by some unknown persons and there is no evidence to prove the complexity of the petitioner in the crime. He further contends that even during investigation, it was found that the petitioner was not the beneficiary of the alleged transactions. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 12.03.2025 and is in custody since then. Even



challan has been presented against him, but no witness has been examined so far. Thus, there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in a serious crime and several accused are yet to be arrested by the police. Learned counsel further contend that even various amounts were illegally transferred from the complainant company and the petitioner is the main accused in the present case. Thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

7. From a perusal of the record, it is evident that all the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate and the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last almost four months. The investigation is complete in all respect and challan has been presented against him. However, the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness so far. Thus, there are no chances of conclusion of the trial in near future.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

03.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No