Bail Matters 871/2026
STATE Vs. MAYUR MARUTI SANAS
FIR No. 11/2025
PS- (Crime Branch-South East)
u/s 308/318(4)/319/340/6(2) BNS

29.04.2026

Present application has been taken up in terms of Order No. 10 dated 06.03.2026 passed by Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge, SED, Saket Courts, New Delhi. (Roster)

This is an application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Mayur Maruti Sanas for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. Sanobar Ali and Sh. Khalid Ashraf, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.
Sh. Yogendra Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the regular bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Mayur Maruti Sanas. Arguments were heard at length, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been languishing in JC 10.12.2025. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused is a young boy, aged about 19 years, having no criminal antecedents, and has been falsely implicated in the present matter as he has nothing to do with the alleged offences. Ld. Counsel further submitted that in the present matter, the investigation is complete, charge-sheet has been filed, and no further custodial interrogation is required. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the earlier bail

application of the applicant/accused was rejected mainly on the ground that the chargesheet had not filed. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused is neither known to the depositor of the alleged amount nor to the subsequent transferees and that there is no material on record to show any connection, meeting of minds or conspiracy between the applicant/accused and any other alleged accused persons. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the FIR does not mention the name of the applicant/accused and has been registered aginst unknown persons which clearly shows that the implication of the applicant/accused is an afterthought. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the investigation is substantially complete and charge-sheet has been filed. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused's further detention amount to punishment, contrary to the principle that 'bail is the rule and jail is the exception'. Ld. Counsel thus, submitted that the applicant/accused ought to be granted bail and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him while granting the bail.

3. *Per contra* Ld. Addl. PP for the State vehemently opposed the bail application citing the gravity of the offences as one of the main grounds. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the applicant/accused is an active participant in an organized cyber fraud syndicate. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the applicant/accused herein is the proprietor and account holder of the Bank of Baroda account used as a mule account for receiving and routing cheated funds. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that

multiple complaints have been linked to the same account, and the applicant has played a crucial role in facilitating the crime. Ld. Addl. PP also contended that there exists a strong likelihood of the applicant/accused influencing witnesses or tampering with evidence, if released on bail. Thus, accused ought not to be granted bail.

4. I have heard the arguments addressed by the opposite parties and perused the record.

5. It is settled law that the Court, while considering the application for grant of bail, has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a *prima facie* case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment, the danger of the accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail; reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened; etc.

6. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that the present FIR was registered on the complaint of one Sh. Sanjay Chopra, a senior citizen, who was allegedly cheated of an amount of Rs. 27,20,000/- in a well-organized online investment scam. During investigation, it was revealed that an amount of Rs. 14,00,000/- out of the cheated money was credited into a bank account held in the name of a fictitious and no-existent firm, namely M/s Nexus IN Broadband. The investigation further revealed that an amount exceeding Rs. 1,07,27,810/- was credited during the period from 14.10.2025 to 01.11.2025,

whereas the closing balance was only Rs. 3829/-, clearly demonstrating systematic diversion of funds.

7. During the course of arguments, it was brought to the fore that the account in question is in the name of the applicant/accused through which Rs. 1.07 crore was routed within a short period including Rs. 14,00,000/- of the complainant. Further, as per the report, the applicant/accused voluntarily disclosed that he opened the said account at the instance of co-accused Gaurav Jadhav for a commission of 2% and knowingly handed over the SIM card and QR cord linked with the account, thereby faciliating fraudulent transactions. Investigation further revealed that the accused along with co-accused Gaurav Jadhav, Mohd. Yousuf Ali @ Sameer and Abrar Khan stayed together at a hotel in Pune from 28.10.2025 to 01.11.2025 during which multiple fraudulent transactions were executed.

8. The allegations against the applicant/accused pertain to a well-organized cyber fraud involving a substantial amount of money. Economic offences of such nature are required to be viewed seriously as they have deep-rooted conspiracies and involve huge loss to the public at large. The material on record reveals that the applicant is not merely a passive account holder but an active participant in facilitating the commission of the offence. Further, the role of the present applicant/accused is different from co-accused persons as he is an active participant and facilitator in the organized cyber fruad syndicate and the account in question is in the name of the applicant/accused.

Further, the eight cyber fraud complaints have been linked with the same account, showing habitual and organized criminal conduct.

9. In the aforementioned circumstances, taking into the account the gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the accused herein, the fact that the investigation of the case is still ongoing and the detail investigation is very much required in the matter, and further, there is a requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused, and also, the possibility of influencing the complaiant and prosecution witnesses also cannot be ruled out, I am of the opinion that bail ought not to be granted to accused Mayur Maruti Sanas at this juncture. Accordingly, the present bail application is hereby dismissed.

10. Needless to say, the above-mentioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the regular bail application stands disposed of.

11. In compliance of **Sanjay Singh Vs. State (Govt of N.C.T of Delhi) Writ Petition Criminal 974/2022**, copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent to convey the order to inmate.

12. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)
ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),
South East District, Saket Court,
New Delhi /29.04.2026