

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -1-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No.HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

IN THE COURT OF NITIN KINRA,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
KARNAL, UID NO.HR0566.

I.

CNR No. HRKR010041512026	CIS No. BA-1232-2026
	Presented on : 17-04-2026 Registered on : 17-04-2026 Decided on : 30-04-2026 Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 13 days

Vijay Untwal @ Arun son of Sh. Ganga Ram, Resident of 88
Ahirpura, Jahangirabadm Huzur, Bhopal (MP).
.....Applicant/Accused.
Versus
State of Haryana
.....Respondent.

II.

CNR No.HRKR010043382026	CIS No. BA-1276-2026
	Presented on : 22-04-2026 Registered on : 22-04-2026 Decided on : 30-04-2026 Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 8 days

Anit Verma son of Sh. Brijesh Kumar Verma, Resident of 4/192, Now
resident of 2/119, Awas Vikas Colony, Nawab Ganj, Babra Banki
(UP).
.....Applicant/Accused.
Versus
State of Haryana
.....Respondent.

FIR No.185 dated 18.11.2025
Under Sections: 318(4) & 61 of BNS
Police Station : Cyber Crime, Karnal

**BAIL APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 483 BNSS FOR
GRANT OF REGULAR BAIL.**

Nitin Kinra
ASJ, Karnal.30.04.2026

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -2-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No. HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

Present : Sh. Vikramjeet, learned counsel for the Applicant/
 Accused Vijay Untwal @ Arun.
 Sh. Brij Bhushan Sharma, learned counsel for the
 Applicant/Accused Anit Verma.
 Sh. Harish Kumar, learned APP for the State/Respondent
 assisted by Sh. Deepak Vadhera, counsel for
 Complainant.

ORDER:

Through this common order, this Court shall decide the
aforementioned two applications for regular bail moved by the applicants
in the above mentioned case.

Facts of the case :

2. The brief facts of the case are that Complainant Jai Ram son
of Thakar Dass, resident of Village Nigdhu, Karnal gave a complaint that
on 13.11.2025 at about 11:00 AM, he received a whatsapp call on his
mobile no. 9466651284 from mobile no. +1(662) 7881936 and the caller
stated that he is speaking his nephew Santti from Canada. The Accused
further stated that he is sending some amount in his account because he
has started the business of work permit Visa. The Accused further
requested him to withdraw the amount and to handover to an agent, who
is coming from Delhi. He refused to oblige the Accused, but he again and
again insisted upon him. Thereafter, Accused demanded his bank account
and he sent his bank account no. 2713000100051855 and thereafter,
Accused sent a fake screenshot of Rs. 7,50,000/- on his mobile. The

Nitin Kinra
ASJ, Karnal.30.04.2026

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -3-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No. HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

Accused also gave mobile no. 95921912422 and Accused also gave bank account no. 223301000012619 of Indian Overseas Bank belonging to Kanta Bai and got transferred Rs. 3,00,000/-. Thereafter, Accused sent the bank accounts of other persons on several dates and on the request of Accused, he (complainant) used to transfer the amount in the bank accounts as given by the Accused and he has transferred total amount of Rs. 27,30,000/-. The Complainant thereby alleged that he has been defrauded of the aforesaid amount. Hence, the complainant sought legal action against the culprits. With these allegations, the present case was registered against the Applicant/Accused. Hence, the above FIR.

Contentions on behalf of Applicant-Petitioner Vijay Untwal:

3. Initiating the arguments, learned counsel for the Applicant/Accused has stated that Applicant/Accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in judicial custody since 05.02.2026. He further submitted that the bail application of the Applicant/Accused is dismissed by the Court of Ms. Nitika Bansal, Ld. JMIC, Karnal vide order dated 02.04.2026. He further submitted that Co-accused Harsh Parjapati has already been granted regular bail by the Court of Sh. Rajneesh Kumar, the then Ld. ASJ, Karnal vide order dated 25.03.2026. He further submitted that investigation is completed and charge-sheet has been filed. He further submitted that Applicant/Accused

Nitin Kinra
ASJ, Karnal.30.04.2026

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -4-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No. HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

is innocent and is not previous convict. He further submitted that nothing is required to be recovered from the Applicant/Accused. It is further submitted that trial of the present case shall take long time and no purpose would be served by keeping the Applicant/Accused behind the bar. Hence, he requested for grant of regular bail to the Applicant/Accused.

Contentions on behalf of Applicant-Petitioner Anit Verma:

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Applicant/Accused Anit Verma has stated that Applicant/Accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in judicial custody since 29.01.2026. He further submitted that the bail application of the Applicant/Accused is dismissed by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 01.04.2026. He further submitted that Co-accused Harsh Parjapati has already been granted regular bail by the Court of Sh. Rajneesh Kumar, the then Ld. ASJ, Karnal vide order dated 25.03.2026. He further submitted that investigation is completed and charge-sheet has been filed. He further submitted that Applicant/Accused undertakes that he will not tamper with any evidence of the prosecution nor he would directly, or indirectly make the inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case. He further submitted that Applicant/Accused is very poor person. The Applicant/Accused is residing in a rented accommodation. The Applicant/Accused was playing cricket with Sarthak Jaiswal and

Nitin Kinra
ASJ, Karnal.30.04.2026

friendly relations were developed. Sarthak Jaiswal disclosed that he and his friend Mohd. Arshad are indulging to extract money from the accounts of some people, by playing fraud upon them. Sarthak Jaiswal and his friend told the Applicant/Accused that if he gives the account of some other people, they will pay 10% of the amount. Hence, the Applicant/Accused opened his account in the bank and the above said persons got transferred Rs. 4,50,000/-. Thereafter, the above said persons put pressure upon him to withdraw the amount and to give them and only Rs. 4500/- were given to him. He further contended that prior to the arrest, the Applicant/Accused was not given notice by the police and no opportunity of hearing was afforded to the Applicant/Accused to bring true and material facts before the police, but the police straightway arrested the accused. Hence, the arrest of the Applicant/Accused is illegal and police have not following the law mentioned in Aarnesh Vs. State of Bihar, and has violated the law mentioned in the above-said authority. It is further submitted that trial of the present case shall take long time and no purpose would be served by keeping the Applicant/Accused behind the bar. Hence, he requested for grant of regular bail to the Applicant/Accused.

Contentions on behalf of Prosecution:

5. On notice, learned Public Prosecutor for State has appeared

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -6-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No. HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

and filed reply to bail applications in which it is mentioned that the petitioners were involved in this well planned fraud and if the petitioners are released on bail then they can commit such type of fraud again, can put pressure upon the witnesses and can abscond from the proceedings of the Court. Lastly he prayed for dismissal of the aforesaid bail applications.

The Hearing

6. The Court has heard the arguments made by learned counsel for the Applicant/Accused and learned APP for the State and has also perused the reply to the bail applications submitted by police.

Analysis

7. It is the case of the prosecution that the accused persons had hatched a conspiracy and in pursuance of the said conspiracy they defrauded the complainant of Rs. 27,30,000/-. As per reply submitted by police, the petitioner Anit Verma was having SBI Bank Account No. 44585846551 and a sum of Rs. 4,50,000/- was credited in the said account from the account of complainant. It has also surfaced on record from the reply to the bail application submitted by the police that the petitioner Anit Verma withdrew the amount of Rs. 3,90,000/- from his aforesaid account by using his cheque bearing No. 076481 and he also withdrew the remaining amount through ATM. Therefore, prima facie it is clear that the

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -7-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No. HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

petitioner Anit Verma was the direct beneficiary of the present fraud, as a sum of Rs. 4,50,000/- was credited into his account which he withdrew.

8. It has also surfaced on record that the petitioner Vijay Untwal was involved in alluring co-accused Harsh Prajapati and at the insistence of petitioner Vijay, co-accused Harsh Prajapati arrange the account numbers of other persons which have been used in this case for committing the fraud. During the course of arguments, it has also been pointed out by learned Public Prosecutor that Petitioner Vijay Untwal promised co-accused Harsh Prajapati to give 10% of the defrauded amount as commission and thereafter, co-accused Harsh Prajapati gave the account numbers of Piyush Prajapati and Kanta Bai (slum dweller) and their account numbers have been used for got crediting the amount from the complainant by defrauding him. It has also been pointed out that the petitioner Vijay Untwal earned Rs. 60,000/- from co-accused Rahul for arranging the aforesaid accounts of Piyush Prajapati and Kanta Bai. Therefore, the involvement of petitioner Vijay Untwal in this well planned fraud is also clear on record. The prolonged custody and submission of challan, ipso facto does not mitigate the offence in question and entitle the petitioners to the concession of bail.

9. In the modern era, youth have been found misusing cyber technology by engaging in various online criminal activities like

cyberbullying, online harassment, identity theft, phishing scams, sharing private information without consent, online extortion, creating and distributing harmful content, and hacking, often facilitated by their extensive access to technology and social media platforms, making them both perpetrators and victims of such crimes. This is because the youth are more familiar with the latest technology unlike the previous generations who had to adapt themselves to digital advancements, whereas the younger people have been using smartphones, computers and internet since their birth. There has been sudden surge in the Cyber Crime in the recent years. The allegations against the petitioners are very serious in nature. The contention that co-accused Harsh Prajapati has been granted bail by the Court of Sh. Rajneesh Kumar, the then Ld. ASJ, Karnal, is of no help of the petitioners in the light of the fact that said Harsh Prajapati had only arranged the account numbers and moreover, his role is different from the role of petitioners in this case. Considering the gravity and seriousness of the offence, role of the petitioners, the amount of fraud (Rs. 27,30,000/-) involved in this case and the manner in which the offence has been committed, this Court is of the view that the petitioners are not entitled to the concession of bail unless and until the complainant and other material witnesses of prosecution are examined in this case as the petitioners may try to influence them in case they are enlarged on bail.

Vijay Untwal @ Arun Versus State of Haryana -9-
(CNR No. HRKR010041512026) (CIS No. BA-1232-2026)
Anit Verma Versus State of Haryana
(CNR No. HRKR010043382026) (CIS No. BA-1276-2026)

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the bail application of petitioners are hereby **dismissed**. File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court.
30.04.2026

(Nitin Kinra)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Karnal.(UID No.HR-0566)

Note: All the pages of this order have been checked & signed by me.

(Nitin Kinra)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Karnal. 30.04.2026

Typed by Harsha, Stenographer Gr.III

Nitin Kinra
ASJ, Karnal.30.04.2026