2026:PHHC:076721

2026:PHHC:076721

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(216) **CRM-M-19851-2026 (O&M)**
Date of decision : 15.05.2026

SHIVA VERMA **... Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jasvir Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab

***

MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNSS") seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.19 dated 03.09.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 337, 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNS") (Section 61(2) of BNS added later on) and Section 66C and 66D of Information Technology Act at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Bathinda.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a statement recorded by the complainant Harinder Singh, alleging that on 19.08.2025, he had received a WhatsApp message and then a WhatsApp call. The caller, while introducing himself as ASI Vijay Khanna posted in CBI, told him that a case of money laundering had been registered against him. By extending threats on the premise that he could be arrested in connection with that case, he subjected him

2026:PHHC:076721

2026:PHHC:076721

to digital arrest during the period from 19.08.2025 till 25.08.2025 and the complainant was made to transfer an amount of Rs. 90 lakh in different bank accounts till 01.09.2025. On realizing that he had been duped of his money, he reported the matter to the police.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that an amount of Rs. 41 lakhs out of the money transferred from the account of the complainant, was credited in a particular bank account maintained with IndusInd Bank, and out of the same, an amount of Rs. 8 lakh was transferred in the account operative in the name of accused Lovpreet Singh. The said Lovpreet Singh was apprehended. He suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he had given details of his bank account to co-accused Tejender Singh and petitioner in lieu of a sum of Rs. 10,000/- and after transfer of an amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- in the said account, he had given the same in cash to Varkha @ Verkha on the asking of accused Tejender Singh. He further disclosed that the present petitioner and co-accused Tejinder Singh had again deposited an amount of Rs.8,00,000/- in the aforementioned account and since his banker had refused to get cash amount of Rs.8,00,000/- withdrawn, hence accused Tejinder Singh took debit card and some signed cheques from him (Lovepreet Singh) pertaining to his bank account and the present petitioner accompanying him had given sum of Rs.1,500/- to him by assuring that they would give him more money. As per the disclosure statement suffered by accused Lovepreet Singh, the petitioner and the co-accused Tejinder had taken him to the concerned Branch of PNB Bank for the purpose of withdrawal of money. The accused Lovepreet also identified the

2026:PHHC:076721

2026:PHHC:076721

petitioner and co-accused Tejinder Singh as well as Varsha from the CCTV footage of the camera installed in the Bank wherein money was given by him to the petitioner and to co-accused Tejinder. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 03.10.2025. The accused Tejinder could not be apprehended. Investigation qua the petitioner stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Lovepreet Singh which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. He is not beneficiary of the transaction. He had no role to play in the entire transaction. He never came in contact with the complainant. Neither any call nor any kind of inducement or allurement whatsoever had been made by him to the complainant. No test identification parade of the petitioner has been got conducted. He is in custody since long. No recovery has been effected from him. He is on bail in another case registered against him. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel while placing reliance upon the status report has vehemently argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. He alongwith the co-accused Tejinder Singh had taken control of bank account of the co-accused Lovepreet Singh who had provided details of the same in greed of money and had used the said bank account for the purpose of transfer of the money withdrawn from the bank account of the complainant by cheating him. The petitioner alongwith the co-accused Tejinder

2026:PHHC:076721

2026:PHHC:076721

Singh firstly got deposited an amount of Rs.2 lakhs in the bank account of Lovepreet and got it withdrawn from him. They had again got deposited an amount of Rs.8 lakhs in the same account and the same was got withdrawn by way of issuance of debit card and cheques. His antecedents are not clean. He is involved in one more case of similar nature. There are chances of his tampering with evidence, committing similar offences or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. Bail petition of co-accused Varsha has already been dismissed. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused Lovepreet Singh and Tejinder Singh is alleged to have got withdrawn an amount of Rs.2 lakhs and 8 lakhs from the bank account of the co-accused Lovepreet Singh by alluring him to provide his account and to receive commission in lieu of the withdrawal of money as deposited in that account which was used for the purpose of fraudulent transaction by way of transfer of money received by committing cyber fraud. In the CCTV footage of the bank from where the amount of Rs.2 lakhs was withdrawn showed the petitioner present alongwith the co-accused Tejinder Singh and Lovepreet Singh. The active complicity of the petitioner in the commission of the subject offences stands prima facie established. The allegations as levelled against the petitioner prima facie indicate his involvement in operational layer of a well-organized cyber fraud. Keeping in view the magnitude of the amount involved, the manner in which the offences were committed, the role of the petitioner in procuring account of the

2026:PHHC:076721

co-accused and facilitating withdrawal of fraudulently obtained money reflecting the gravity of the allegations levelled against him. Such like crimes are on the rice. Every day one or the other public person is being duped of his/her hard-earned money. The apprehension raised by the respondent-State that the petitioner may commit similar offences, tamper with evidence or may abscond cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. In view of the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

15.05.2026 **Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No**
Amit Sharma **Whether reportable:- Yes/No**