

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD
R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR REGULAR BAIL - AFTER
CHARGESHEET) NO. 1704 of 2026

=====

MOHAMAD @ M.D. S/O AARBI MANIYAR
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

MR MAKBUL I MANSURI(2694) for the Applicant(s) No. 1
MR SOAHAM JOSHI, APP for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE UTKARSH THAKORBHAI
DESAI

Date : 23/03/2026

ORAL ORDER

1. The applicant herein, who came to be arrested by Cybercrime Border Range Police Station, District Kuchchh, has preferred the present application under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, praying for regular bail. The offence is alleged to have been committed under Sections 318(4), 319, 308(6), 336(3), 127(2), 127(8), 61(2)(A) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 as well as under Sections 66(c) and 66(d) of the Information of Technology Act, 2000, which came to be registered vide FIR Part-A-I C.R. No.11205046250007 of 2025 on 18.07.2025. The investigation having been completed, chargesheet has been

filed, wherein the applicant is shown as accused No.2.

2. Heard learned advocate Mr. Makbul Mansuri for the applicant and learned APP Mr. Soaham Joshi for the respondent – State.

3. As per the prosecution case, the original complainant had received a mobile phone call from an unknown number, whereby, the caller had introduced himself as the police official from Colaba Police Station. The original complainant was informed that, a money laundering case was registered against him and an arrest warrant with a stamp of Supreme Court of India, was sent to him through whatsapp. The original complainant was digitally arrested and was compelled to keep his video call continuously on for 2 days, pursuant to which, he was threatened and was compelled to reveal his bank details, from wherein, the said accused person had got transferred Rs.76 lakhs, which was deposited in two bank accounts opened with Yes Bank. Further, out of the said

amount of Rs.76 lakhs, Rs. 10 lakhs were transferred to the account of co-accused Sahil Mustak Khatri with City Union Bank, which account was thereafter handed over to the present applicant, who had further transferred the said account to co-accused Subhash Brijlal Chandra and thereafter, the said co-accused Subhash had further transferred the said account to co-accused Balveer@Ballu, who in turn had given the said account to co-accused Mukesh@Kuldip.

4. At the outset, the applicant has 4 previous antecedents of identical nature. On perusing the chargesheet papers it appears that, the applicant got acquainted with co-accused Shubham Chaudhary in the year 2021, who had asked him to rent him bank accounts on commission, pursuant to which, the applicant had given around 7 to 9 accounts to the said co-accused Shubham Chaudhary. It also appears that, the said co-accused Shubham Chaudhary had introduced the applicant to co-accused Subhash, who also had asked for bank accounts from

the applicant, in lieu of commission pursuant to which, the applicant had given co-accused Sahil Mustak Khatri's bank account to the said co-accused Subhash.

4.1 On further perusing the chargesheet papers, it appears that the applicant was conversant with the alleged financial transactions which were carried out in the bank accounts, which were supplied by him to the co-accused and he also being aware about the said transactions pertaining to digital arrest scams.

5. Learned advocate Mr. Makbul Mansuri for the applicant has relied upon the orders passed by the Coordinate Bench granting bail to the co-accused, however, as observed by the said Bench in its orders, co-accused Sahil Mustak Khatri and Balveer@Ballu Hanuman Ram Bishnoi had no antecedents, whereas, the co-accused Subhash Brijlal Chandra was not connected with the principal accused. Thus, as compared to the roles of these co-accused persons, the role of the present

applicant is much more graver and severe, hence, the benefit of parity cannot be extended in favour of the applicant.

6. In the event, considering the role of the applicant in the crime, he being in active association with the main accused and being aware about the nature of fraudulent transactions as pertaining to the digital arrest of the original complainant, and also considering his previous antecedents of identical nature, this Court is not inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the applicant. Hence, the present regular bail application is hereby rejected.

KAJAL

(UTKARSH THAKORBHAI DESAI, J)

Original copy of this order has been signed by the Hon'ble Judge.
Digitally signed by: KAJAL KISHORBHAI NAVLAKHA(HCD0076), ENGLISH STENOGRAPHER GRADE TWO CLASS TWO, at High Court of Gujarat on 27/05/2026 13:39:45