



2026:PHHC:087901

2026:PHHC:087901



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**120**

**CRM-M-34416-2026**

**Date of decision :22.06.2026**

**JITENDER**

**... PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.**

**...RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Mudgil, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shashank Bhandari, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 167 dated 21.05.2026, registered under Sections 316(2) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 406 and 420 of the IPC), at Police Station Sadar Dabwali, District Sirsa, Haryana.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that an amount was credited to his bank account through a transfer made by Smt. Suman Roy. According to the petitioner, he was legitimately entitled to receive the said amount towards discharge of a pre-existing liability arising out of earlier transactions and dealings between them. It is contended that the petitioner is a bona fide recipient of the money and has been falsely implicated in the present case.

3. The State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. It is



CRM-M-34416-2026

-2-

submitted that, during investigation, it was found that the petitioner himself withdrew the amount from different accounts at Guwahati. The learned State counsel contends that the plea taken by the petitioner that he had received the money from Smt. Suman Roy is false and unsupported by any credible material. Rather, according to the investigation, the amount credited to the petitioner's account was transferred directly from the complainant's account and not from the account of Smt. Suman Roy, as claimed by the petitioner.

4. On consideration of the matter, I find that the allegations pertain to a serious offence involving cybercrime and warrants thorough investigation, including the custodial interrogation of the petitioner. The material available on record indicates that the amount in question was credited directly to the petitioner's bank account from the account of the complainant and not from the account of Smt. Suman Roy, as claimed by the petitioner.

5. In these circumstances, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

6. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, which shall be considered independently during the course of investigation and trial.

7. Dismissed.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

22.06.2026  
manoj

(PARMOD GOYAL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes  
Yes/No