IN THE COURT OF VI ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT, BENGALURU.

Dated this the 09th day of June, 2026

PRESENT
Sri. Devananda B.Com., LL.M.
VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

<u>Crl.Misc.No.1091/2026</u>

Petitioner: Mr. Purnendu Das,
Aged about 28 years,
S/o Kamalesh Chandra Das,
R/o Jognath Tala Road, PO and PS
Nabadwip, Nadia,
West Bengal-741 302.

(Rep. By Murtuza Ali Baig, Advocate)

-Vs-

Respondent: State by Bengaluru CEN Police Station.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

<u>ORDER</u>

This petition is filed by the petitioner/accused U/Sec.482 of BNSS seeking a direction to respondent-

Police to release him on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.185/2025 registered by the respondent-police for the offences punishable U/sec. 66(C), 66(D) of the IT Act and under Sec. 319(2), 318(4) of BNS.

2. The facts averred in the complaint preferred by the complainant discloses that, on November 12, 2025, at around 11:30 AM, the complainant lodged a formal complaint regarding an incident that occurred on November 7, 2025, at around 5:45 PM. An unknown individual called the complainant's phone from mobile number 9471695419. The caller claimed to be from the TRAI (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India) team and alleged that another mobile number (9898054277) belonging to the complainant was being used for illegal activities. The caller threatened the complainant by naming their family members. Subsequently, a video call was made from another mobile number (6026483824). Under duress, a total sum of ₹6,24,000/- was transferred in stages via UPI and bank transfers from the complainant's Indian Bank account (972066307) to three unknown/beneficiary

bank accounts without the complainant's full awareness of the trap.

1. UCO Bank A/C: 1390110111482
2. ICICI Bank A/C: 193305500581
3. AXIS Bank A/C: 921020033820181

The complainant filed the case seeking legal action against the unknown fraudsters for intimidation and cheating and requested the recovery of the stolen money. The police are currently investigating the matter, and the prosecution is using these facts to oppose the petitioner's (Purnendu Das) anticipatory bail request.

3. Based on the said information, the respondent-Police have registered FIR against the accused for the above said offences. Now, the petitioner who is accused of commission of offences alleged, apprehending his arrest at the hands of respondent-Police, has filed this petition seeking pre-arrest bail on the following amongst other grounds:

The Petitioner acted under a sincere, bonafide belief that the financial transactions involved were part of a legitimate loan arrangement. He had no knowledge, reason to believe, or means to know that the funds credited to his accounts were linked to criminal activity. He discovered the alleged offense only after his bank accounts were frozen and an amount of Rs. 3,50,280/- was disbursed from his ICICI Bank account on December 23, 2025, by order of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bangalore Rural District. The Petitioner has no objection to the rightful claimant receiving the money, which he highlights as proof of his innocence. The Petitioner has never contacted the complainant, Murugesan Dilip Kumar. The phone numbers and the UCO Bank account number (1390110111482) mentioned in the FIR do not belong to him and have no connection to him. He only owns three registered SIM cards. The Petitioner has already filed an online complaint regarding this incident on the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal (Acknowledgment No. 33205260038955). Notices under Section 35(3) of the BNSS were issued on December 09, 2025, directing him to appear within three days. The Petitioner failed to comply because he never received the notices through the post and only found out about them later. Travel from Nabadwip, West Bengal to Bengaluru, Karnataka on short notice was further prevented by financial constraints and an inability to secure train reservations. The Petitioner faces a genuine apprehension of arrest under FIR No. 0185/2026 (Bengaluru CEN Crime Police Station) under Sections 66(C) and 66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, and Sections 319(2) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. He argues that custodial interrogation is unnecessary because the case relies entirely on traceable digital and documentary bank records, which he is fully willing to provide. He is a first-generation entrepreneur with no criminal history or prior convictions. The Petitioner is ready to cooperate fully with the investigation and appear before the Investigating Officer. He agrees to comply with standard bail conditions, including not tampering with evidence, notifying authorities of address changes and attending all court hearings. He confirms that no other anticipatory bail application regarding this FIR is pending before any court. Based on the aforesaid grounds he seek for allowing of the petition.

4. The bail petition was opposed by the learned Public Prosecutor for state by filing his objections. If granted anticipatory bail, there is a strong possibility that the applicant will go into permanent hiding, fail to appear for court trials, and evade the police. The applicant is highly likely to threaten, intimidate, or influence the complainant and prosecution witnesses to prevent them from testifying before the court. There is a risk that the applicant will destroy, consume, or tamper with evidence. The grounds and reasons provided by the applicant in the anticipatory bail application are baseless and are explicitly denied. The allegations in the initial complaint prima facie (on the face of it) prove the charges against the applicant. The case is currently under investigation. The police still need to question more witnesses, record statements, collect evidence, and recover materials/property involved in the crime from the applicant. There is also a high probability that the applicant will engage in similar criminal activities if released. The case involves two specific ICICI Bank accounts (Account Nos: 921020033820181 and 193305500581) under the name of 'Das', who is mentioned

as the applicant's son. This is a "Digital Arrest" fraud case, where the accused allegedly threatened and deceived the complainant to illegally obtain ₹6,24,000/-. Based on the aforesaid grounds of objections, the prosecution seeks for rejection of anticipatory bail petition.

5. Heard arguments on both sides. Perused the records.

6. The following points that arise for consideration of this court are:

1. Whether the petitioner has made out sufficient grounds for grant of anticipatory bail?

2. What order?

7. The finding of this court on the above said points are as under:

Point No. 1: In the Affirmative.

Point No. 2: As per final order, for the following;

<u>REASONS</u>

8. **<u>POINT NO.1</u>**: The petitioner along with petition has produced certified copies of FIR, information, remand application, requisition, arrest report and copy of Adhaar card.

9. The petitioner is accused of commission of offences punishable U/Ss. 66(C), 66(D) of the IT Act and under Sec. 319(2), 318(4) of BNS are cognizable, apprehension of accused-petitioner of his arrest is well founded. As such, he can maintain this petition.

10. The learned counsel for petitioner urged that, the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged by the informant. The informant has lodged false information against the petitioner. On the other hand, the learned PP submitted that, there is prima-facie case against the petitioner. If he is released on bail, there are chances of petitioner giving threat to the witnesses, destroying of evidence, abscond permanently and derail the investigation process.

11. On examination of over all materials placed before the court by the investigating agency through prosecution as well as by the petitioner, it could be ascertained that the offences alleged against the accused are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. There are no chances of causing interference with the investigation by this accused/petitioner and causing threat to the prosecution witnesses or destroying the evidence or proof of prosecution. The accused/petitioner appears to be the permanent resident of address mentioned in the cause title of the petition. The prima-facie involvement of this accused/petitioner appears to be doubtful at this stage of the proceedings. There are no previous criminal antecedents found against this accused/petitioner. The dispute is in respect of monetary transactions. The requisite documentary evidence already available. The presence of this accused/petitioner for custodial interrogation is not required at this stage of the proceedings. He can co-operate with investigating agency after disposing of this bail petition also. Further in respect of apprehension expressed by the prosecution and on the

basis of the manner in which the alleged offences committed against the complainant and amount involved thereon and this accused/petitioner being native of West Bengal, it is just and necessary to impose one of the conditions to furnish cash security amount of Rs.50,000/- by accused/petitioner along with other conditions will fulfill the object under the facts and circumstances of this case. Therefore, this court is of the opinion that the petition preferred by the petitioner merits the consideration of this court and deserves to be allowed in the interest of justice as the petitioner has made out sufficient grounds to consider his petition and hence, this court hereby answers the point no.1 in the **Affirmative**.

12. **POINT NO.2:** In view of the discussions and findings to above said point no.1, this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Petition filed by petitioner/accused U/Sec.482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, in the event of arrest of petitioner/accused in Crime No.185/2025 of Bengaluru CEN Police Station, he is ordered to be released on bail, on his executing personal bond for a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- and with a surety for like-sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Police Officer and to furnish cash security amount of Rs.50,000/- in the office of concerned Judicial Magistrate court on the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on or before one month from the date of this order and in that event Investigation Officer to take bonds and to release him.

2. He shall appear before investigating officer as and when called upon and to extend fullest co-operation in the investigation.

3. He shall not cause threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

4. He shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner.

(Dictated to the Stenographer transcribed by her and transcript, corrected by me and then pronounced in open Court on this the **09th day of June, 2026**)

(Devananda)
VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

Order pronounced in open court
(vide separate order sheet)

ORDER

Petition filed by petitioner/accused U/Sec. 482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, in the event of arrest of petitioner/accused in Crime No.185/2025 of Bengaluru CEN Police Station, he is ordered to be released on bail, on his executing personal bond for a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- and with a surety for like-sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Police Officer and to furnish cash security amount of Rs.50,000/- in the office of concerned Judicial Magistrate court on the following conditions:

1. The petitioner/accused shall appear before the Investigating Officer on or before one month from the date of this order and in that event Investigation Officer to take bonds and to release him.

2. He shall appear before investigating officer as and when called upon and to extend fullest co-operation in the investigation.

3. He shall not cause threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

4. He shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner.

VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.