सत्यमेव जयते

GJSR010106582026

Instituted on	05/08/2026
Registered on	05/08/2026
Decided on	12/08/2026
Duration	Y __ Mo __ Days 07

IN THE COURT OF 10^{TH} ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, AT SURAT

Cr. M. A. No. 5740 OF 2026
(Regular Bail After Charge-Sheet)
Exh.__

Applicant/ : Accused — **Ankit Vishrambhai Maurya**
Aged about 28 years, Occupation : Business,
Resident of : 104, Ghanshyam Nagar,
Vadod Gam, Pandesara, Surat.

(At present in Lajpore Central Jail, Surat)

VERSUS

Opponent : State of Gujarat

Application to Grant Bail u/s.483 of B. N. S. S.

(Amroli Police Station, C. R. No. 11210004261258/2026)
(Offence U/s. 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 338, 54 of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and U/s. 66(D) of Information Technology Act)

For Applicant / Accused :- Ld. Advocate Mr. K. V. Rajput
For Opponent :- Ld. APP Mr. A. P. Vasoya

-: J U D G M E N T :-

(1) This regular bail application has been filed after charge-sheet by the present applicant, who is in judicial custody, in connection with the offence punishable under Section 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 338, 54 of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and U/s. 66(D) of Information Technology Act, registered *vide* C.R.No.11210004261258/2026 at Amroli Police Station.

(2) An affidavit by the I.O. is produced *vide* Exh.4, interalia objecting the bail application and stated that the applicant/accused is habitual offender as he is also involved in five other criminal offences of similar nature *i.e.* cybre crime.

(3) Heard the Ld. respective both the sides at length.

(4) First of all Ld. Advocate Mr. K. V. Rajput for the applicant has argued that the present accused has not played any role in the present offence and he is not directly involved in this offence. Further, even after the judicial custody the bank account of the present applicant/accused was operated that means his bank account has been used illegally. The investigation is over and charge-sheet is filed hence, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence of prosecution. It is further submitted that though the applicant/accused is involved in other similar type of criminal offences however, he is never convicted in any of the offences. The applicant/accused is residing at Surat, and will not flee

away from justice and will be readily available for Trial. The applicant/accused is 28 years young person and if he will be kept behind bar for long period it will affect him mentally too. It is further submitted that punishment prescribed in the said offence is not a capital punishment and/or life imprisonment. It is further submitted that the co-accused of the said offence has been released on bail by the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat hence, the present applicant/accused is entitled for principle of Parity. Further, the alleged amount is not so huge, but nominal amount. Hence, if present bail application will not be granted, it would tantamount to have pre-trial conviction, hence, it is requested to grant the present bail application.

(5) *Per contra,* Ld. APP Mr. A. P. Vasoya, for the State has also vehemently argued that yet the investigation is going on and the complainant was induced through Instagram, Telegram and WhatsApp platforms to invest in a fraudulent scheme promising exorbitant returns, and was dishonestly induced to transfer Rs.12,895/- on the basis of false profit statements. After the investigation of the money, it reveals that the cheated amount was routed through various bank and merchant accounts and ultimately credited to the accounts of present applicant/accused, Rinku Shrikrishna Vishwakarma and co-accused Anurag Maurya. It is further submitted that the accused, in conspiracy with other absconding co-accused, operated the fraudulent investment scheme and substantial transactions amounting to crores of rupees

have been detected in their respective bank accounts. The applicant/accused is also involved in five other similar type of offences hence, he is habitual offender and it is not appropriate to release him on regular bail. Hence, looking to the nature of the offence *i.e.* cyber crime and huge transaction is involved and it has not yet been ascertained, hence, it is requested to reject the present bail application.

(6) Having heard the arguments advanced by both the sides and perused the police papers and affidavit filed by IO, it appears that the complainant was induced through Instagram, Telegram and WhatsApp platforms to invest in a fraudulent investment scheme on the false promise of earning exorbitant returns. In furtherance of the said conspiracy, the complainant and was dishonestly induced to transfer Rs.12,895/- on the basis of fabricated profit statements and false representations made by the accused persons. The investigation has further revealed substantial financial transactions amounting to crores of rupees in the respective bank accounts of the accused persons, which *prima-facie* indicates their active participation in the commission of the offence and their involvement in a well-organized cyber fraud racket. So far as the use of bank account of the present applicant/accused is concerned it is *prima-facie* believed that in collusion with the absconding accused the entire fraud has been committed. Earlier bail application filed by the present accused was rejected and this application is filed after filing of charge-sheet however, it cannot be

considered as a sole ground to release the applicant/accused on regular bail. It further appears that several five other similar type of criminal offences are registered against the present applicant/accused on NCCRP portal and in bank account of the present accused, there is transaction about Rs.1.2 crores, hence, he is habitual offender. So far parity is concerned, as other co-accused has been released on regular bail by Hon’ble High Court of Gujarat, but looking to the role attributed to the present applicant as well as past antecedents of the applicant, it is not appropriate to apply parity on him. So, if at this juncture, applicant will be released on bail, there is strong apprehension that she may again involve in such kind of offences as well as of threats and tampering with prosecution evidence.

(7) In the light of the above discussions as well as by considering the settled law of bail that, when the case is arisen for the possibility of fleeing away of the accused and tampering of the evidence of prosecution, bail should definitely be denied. In the present case the conduct of the applicant itself suggests, that if the bail application will be granted ultimately the applicant would be given green flag to commit similar kind of offences and thereby the investigation which is an exclusive right of the Investigating Agency would be frustrated. In this situation, I decline the arguments of the Ld. Advocate for the applicant and come to the conclusion that this is not a fit case to grant the regular

bail. Hence the following order is passed in the interest of justice.

O R D E R

The present application of the applicant/accused **Ankit Vishrambhai Maurya** to grant regular Bail is hereby **"Rejected"**.

Yadi be sent to concerned police station and Jail Authority.

Pronounced in the open Court today on this **12th day of August, 2026** under my hand and seal of this Court.

Digitally signed by
PRAKASH K KHANCHANDANI
on 12/08/2026 17:38:31 IST.

Dated : 12/08/2026
Place: Surat

(Prakash Khubchand Khanchandani)
10th Additional Sessions Judge, Surat
(GJ00806)

DS