IN THE COURT OF MR. HARGURVARINDER SINGH JAGGI, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (FTC– 01), SOUTH DISTRICT, SAKET COURTS, NEW DELHI

Bail Matter No.: 1090/2026
CNR No.: DLST01-006353-2026
FIR No.: 79/2025
Police Station: Cyber (South)
u/Section: 112(2), 317(2), 61(2), BNS 2023

IN THE MATTER OF:

STATE … **Non-Applicant**

Through – Mr. Santosh Kumar, Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

v.

RAMAN KUMAR … **Applicant**

Through – Mr. Avtar Singh and Mr. Amrik Singh, Advocates for the Applicant.

Date of filing of bail application:	**24.05.2026**
Date of reserving order:	**08.06.2026**
Date of pronouncement of order:	**09.06.2026**

ORDER

09.06.2026

1. Raman Kumar (Applicant) has moved an application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) seeking regular bail in relation to FIR No. 0079/2025 dated 20.11.2025 (FIR 79/2025) registered at police station Cyber Police Station, South, Delhi under Sections 112(2), 317(2), and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. Since 30.04.2026, the applicant, Raman Kumar has been in custody.

Facts

3. The factual narration as traced from the FIR 79/2025 and the record is that on 20.11.2025, an FIR was registered upon receiving secret inputs and analyzing National Cybercrime Reporting Portal (NCRP) data, which revealed that several mule bank accounts operating within the South District were being used for receiving cheated money arising from PAN-India cyber fraud complaints.

4. During technical analysis, an account in the Bank of Baroda belonging to one Pradeep was identified as a mule account. Upon his arrest, Pradeep disclosed the involvement of his associate Brijesh. Brijesh was subsequently apprehended, and ATM cards and passbooks of the mule accounts were recovered from him.

5. During the course of the investigation, Brijesh disclosed the name of the applicant, Raman Kumar, as the main handler of the organized cyber-fraud syndicate who procured the mule bank accounts

to route the cheated money. Following the dismissal of his anticipatory bail applications by the learned Sessions Court and the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the applicant surrendered before the learned Trial Court on 30.04.2026 and was remanded to judicial custody.

Bail application & Reply by IO

6. Raman Kumar in the bail application has prayed that the applicant be released on regular bail in the proceedings arising out of FIR 79/2025 centering on the plank that he has been falsely implicated in the subject matter solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by the co-accused.

7. The primary contention lodged by the applicant in the bail application is that there is no direct complaint of cheating against him and no one was directly cheated by him in this FIR. The applicant claims parity with the co-accused Pradeep and Brijesh, who were already granted regular bail by the Trial Court on 12.01.2026. He further asserts that independent witnesses (such as Kuldeep), who actually operated the bank accounts, have been made witnesses rather than accused.

8. The Investigating Officer (IO) in the reply strongly opposed the bail application stating that the applicant is the main handler and mastermind of an organized cyber-fraud syndicate involved in procuring mule bank accounts. The IO highlighted that the applicant's own bank accounts have been reported in multiple NCRP cyber fraud complaints. Furthermore, despite being served with notices under Section 35(3) of the BNSS, the applicant evaded investigation, and

when he did join the investigation under the garb of interim protection, he gave evasive replies and completely failed to cooperate.

Submissions by Counsels

9. Mr. Avtar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant opened their arguments in tandem with the averments made in the bail application. The learned counsel drew attention of the Court to the fact that the subject FIR, i.e., FIR No. 79/2025 was not lodged at the behest of any complainant or victim. The learned counsel submitted that it was a *suo moto* FIR without any aggrieved person, “who was cheated?”, “what amount of money was cheated?”

10. Mr. Singh, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the investigation *qua* the applicant is complete and his police custody is already over. Mr. Singh, learned counsel for the applicant strongly pressed the ground of parity, arguing that identically situated co-accused persons have been granted bail, and further relied upon the settled principles of bail jurisprudence to contend that the applicant's continued incarceration is uncalled for.

11. *Per contra*, Mr. Santosh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor (APP) submitted that this is not a fit case of bail as urged by the learned counsel for the applicant.

12. The learned APP further submitted that the applicant is not a mere participant but the kingpin who systematically procured mule accounts to launder funds defrauded from innocent citizens across the country. The learned APP further submitted that the applicant is the

main person, who poaches for accounts (mule and target accounts), handles them and withdraws the money after the same is funnelled out through multiple bank accounts.

13. The learned APP emphasized that the investigation is ongoing regarding the vast money trail, digital evidence, and the identification of other associates to whom the applicant supplied the accounts.

14. Mr. Singh learned counsel for the applicant rejoined their arguments by strongly contending the submissions advanced by the learned APP. The learned counsel once again urged that the applicant has been falsely implicated by the police, he has deep roots in the society, and he undertakes to abide by all conditions imposed by the Court.

Analysis & Findings

15. On careful perusal of the application, reply/objections filed by the IO and weighty arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, the Court has to answer the question, whether the applicant, Raman Kumar can be granted the relief of regular bail as sought?

16. At the stage of granting of bail, only a *prima facie* case needs to be examined and detailed reasons relating to the merits of the case that may cause prejudice to the accused, ought to be avoided. The bail order should reveal the factors that have been considered by the Court for granting relief to the accused – ***See Ajwar v. Waseem & Anr. – 2024 INSC 438, pp.28.***

17. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Shaveta Kataria v. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr. – 2025 DHC 8043*** while relying upon the law reports of the Apex Court in ***Brijmani Devi v. Pappu Kumar & Anr. – (2022) 4 SCC 497*** and ***Mahipal v. Rajesh Kumar @ Polia – (2020) 2 SCC 118*** observed that the law is well settled that bail proceedings are not intended to mirror the evidentiary rigour of a full-fledged trial. To engage in a detailed assessment of competing versions at this stage would risk converting the bail hearing into a mini-trial, something courts are consistently cautioned against.

18. The Apex Court has held in the catena of law reports that bail is a discretionary relief, to be granted or denied based on the specific facts and circumstances of each case. The Apex Court in its landmark judgment of ***Prasanta Kumar Sarkar v. Ashis Chatterjee and Anr. – 2010 INSC 752***, laid down the following *legal principles*:

(i) Whether there is any *prima facie* or reasonable ground to believe that accused had committed the offence;

(ii) Nature and gravity of the accusation;

(iii) Severity of the punishment in the event of conviction

(iv) Danger of the accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail;

(v) Character, behaviour, means position, and standing of the accused;

(vi) Likelihood of the offence being repeated;

(vii) Reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being influenced, and

(viii) Danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail.

19. In light of the above stated legal principles, the answer to the pointed question about grant of bail to the applicant, Raman Kumar is emphatic: ***No***.

20. The learned counsel for the applicant, while pressing for bail, relied on general principles of bail jurisprudence and claimed parity with the co-accused. However, these contentions must be assessed against the established precedents and the factual matrix of the case.

21. *Firstly*, the applicant's counsel relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51*** to argue that bail is the rule and that mechanical detention is frowned upon.

22. However, the reliance placed on this judgment is entirely misconceived in the present factual scenario. The Supreme Court in ***Satender Kumar Antil's case*** explicitly placed a caveat that the benefit of the guidelines cannot be extended to an accused who does not cooperate with the investigation, fails to appear before the Investigating Officers, or does not answer summons.

23. In the present case, the record reflects that the applicant deliberately evaded the investigation despite notices issued under Section 35(3) of the BNSS. Furthermore, when he did join the investigation under the shield of interim protection granted by the higher courts, he gave evasive replies and completely failed to

cooperate in unearthing the money trail. Thus, the applicant's active evasion and non-cooperation strictly disentitle him to any equitable relief under the aforementioned guidelines.

24. *Secondly*, the applicant vehemently pressed the ground of parity, asserting that identically situated co-accused persons, namely Pradeep and Brijesh, have already been enlarged on regular bail by the Trial Court. This claim of parity is legally fallacious.

25. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sagar v. State of UP – 2025 INSC 1370***, has categorically held that the principle of parity is not an absolute rule and cannot be claimed as a matter of right; it must be assessed based on the specific role attributed to each accused. The roles are highly distinguishable. The co-accused were mere nodes, account holders or withdrawers in the network, whereas the applicant Raman Kumar is identified as the mastermind and the main handler who systematically procured these mule accounts from innocent persons on false pretexts.

26. Moreover, the applicant's own bank accounts have been flagged in multiple NCRP cyber fraud complaints. Thus, the applicant stands on an entirely different and far graver footing than the co-accused, and parity cannot be extended.

27. *Thirdly*, this is a successive bail application filed by the applicant. His earlier regular bail application was dismissed on merits by the Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate on 22.05.2026. The Supreme Court has consistently held that successive bail applications without

any substantial change in circumstances are not maintainable. The mere passage of a few days does not constitute a material change in circumstances, especially when the investigation into the complex digital evidence and the broader financial conspiracy is still at a crucial stage.

28. As observed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in ***Paramjit Kharb v. State – 2025 DHC 9638***, highly organized cyber-crimes with trans-territorial ramifications demand heightened judicial caution, and leniency at the bail stage undermines deterrence.

29. Keeping in mind the applicant's central role as the mastermind of a PAN-India cyber-fraud syndicate, his previous evasive conduct, and the necessity of tracing the massive illicit funds, his release poses a significant threat of tampering with digital evidence and influencing witnesses.

Decision

30. In view of the above deliberations and observations, the Court declines to grant regular bail to the applicant, Raman Kumar at this stage. Accordingly, the bail application moved by the applicant, ***Raman Kumar*** titled as ***State v. Raman Kumar – Bail Matter No. 1090/2026*** is dismissed.

31. Any observation made here-in-above for the purpose of dealing with the contentions raised during the hearing of the bail application shall not be deemed to be an expression on the merits of the case.

32. Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the applicant, Raman Kumar through the concerned Jail Superintendent and also given *dasti* to the applicant through counsel.

33. Further, let a copy of the order be transmitted to the concerned IO/SHO, police station Cyber Police Station, South, for information and necessary compliance, if any.

34. File be consigned to the Record Room only after due compliances, necessary action, if any, as per applicable rules.

Hargurvarinder Singh jaggi

Digitally signed by Hargurvarinder Singh jaggi
Date: 2026.06.09 15:32:41 +0530

Pronounced in the open Court on June 09, 2026 *nk*	**(Hargurvarinder Singh Jaggi)** **Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC-01)** **South District** **Saket Courts, New Delhi**

Note: *This order comprises **10** pages in total. The electronic signature certificate (digital signature) of the Presiding Officer has been appended on the last page of the electronic or digital copy (PDF) of this document.*