

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3609 of 2026

Suraj Chauhan son of Late Mukesh Chauhan **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anjani Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Vishwanath Roy, APP

05/29.04.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 22.12.2025 in connection with Bankmore P.S. Case No. 309 of 2025, for the offences registered under Sections 318(2), 318(3), 318(4) 319(2), 336(2), 336 (3), 338,340(2), and 61(2), of the B.N.S. 2023 and Sections 66B, 66C and 66D of I.T. Act,2000, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-Cum-Special Judge Cyber Cases, Dhanbad.

3. The learned counsel has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although there are 9 ATM Cards and 2 mobile phones have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner along with a number of screen shots in the mobile. He has further submitted that the recovery of mobile phones and SIM cards has been explained by the petitioner in his confessional statement by stating that the petitioner is operating a cyber café at Noida and different labourers used to come to take money and he used to give money to the labourers and later on with the help of their ATM Cards he used to withdraw the money. However, it is not in dispute that the petitioner was apprehended in the Hotel at Dhanbad and he also stated that altogether Rs.18 lacs was withdrawn which was taken away by the co-accused Raj Kumar Mandal and Binod Kumar Mandal. It also appears that the machine for generating finger print was also recovered from the possession of the petitioner at Dhanbad.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the WhatsApp chats were further

investigated and the name of various account holder could be identified in connection with which as many as 61 complaints have been registered in online portal belonging to different states all over India. He has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in large scale cyber fraud and he may not be enlarged on bail.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances leading to recovery of mobile phones and numerous ATMs which admittedly do not belong to the petitioner and in the further investigation it has come that linking the WhatsApp chats with the defrauded account, numerous complaints of cyber offence has been recorded all over India against the petitioner and co-accused, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

7. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 29.04.2026

Uploaded on: 30.04.2026

Binit/