



\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

*Reserved on: July 03, 2026*  
*Pronounced on: July 06, 2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2227/2026**

**RAJU KUMAR MANJHI**

**.....Applicant**

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Nalin Tripathi, Mr. Nishank Tripathi, Mr. Nischal Tripathi and Ms. Harshita Sukhija, Advs.

Versus

**CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION .....Respondent**

Through: Mr. Vikrant Pachnanda, SPP for CBI with Mr. Mukul Katyal, Adv.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE**

**J U D G M E N T**

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023<sup>1</sup>, the applicant Raju Kumar Manjhi seeks grant of regular bail in connection with FIR No.RC2212024E0022 dated 07.12.2024 registered by the Central Bureau of Investigation<sup>2</sup> at PS: EO-III, Delhi under *Sections 120B/170/419/420/343/346/388* of the Indian Penal Code, 1860<sup>3</sup> and *Section 66D* of the Information Technology Act, 2000<sup>4</sup>.

2. *Succinctly put*, as per prosecution, the aforesaid FIR was registered

<sup>1</sup> Hereinafter referred to as "*BNSS*"

<sup>2</sup> Hereinafter referred to as "*CBI*"

<sup>3</sup> Hereinafter referred to as "*IPC*"

<sup>4</sup> Hereinafter referred to as "*IT Act*"



against unknown person(s), wherein it was alleged that an elaborate cyber-fraud network was operating from India and abroad, targeting Indian citizens by impersonating as law enforcement and courier agencies personnel. The syndicate employed the *modus operandi* of intimidation and digital surveillance/ digital arrest to extort monies from the victims. In fact, the FIR specifically contained ten incidents during the period from January to October 2024 involving ten different victims including Mr. Anshu Mittal, who was alleged to be contacted by persons impersonating as FedEx and Mumbai Cyber Crime official and was kept under digital confinement from 29.12.2023 to 01.01.2024. During the said period, said Mr. Anshu Mittal was threatened with serious criminal charges punishable with life imprisonment and was coerced into making two high-value transactions aggregating to Rs.48,56,275/- into two separate bank accounts of M/s. Balaji Enterprises (Rs.15,93,000/-) and M/s. Sabir Enterprises (Rs.32,63,275/-).

3. Subsequently upon completion of investigation, a charge-sheet has been filed *qua* the allegations relating to the victim Mr. Anshu Mittal arraigning, *inter alia*, the present applicant as an accused and specifically setting out his role as under:

*“16.23 Investigation revealed that Raju Kumar Manjhi is a key member of an organized cyber-fraud and money-laundering syndicate.*

*16.24 During investigation IP logs for the PNB A/c No. 1718202100001102 of M/s. Sabir Enterprise were analyzed and IPDRs obtained from the concerned TSPs. The account's internet banking was accessed via Airtel networks on 29.12.2023 and 30.12.2023, and subsequently, from 30.12.2023 to 01.01.2024, consistently through proxy servers*



including Alibaba US Technology Co., DIGITALOCEAN-ASN, and HostRoyale Technologies Pvt. Ltd., including on the dates of the fraudulent transactions. In two Instances, the IPs were traced to Indian numbers, notably 9717161185. which accessed the account from Etawah-Kanpur Highway, Agra-Lucknow Expressway, and Gurugram on 29-30.12.2023.

16.25 Investigation has revealed that mobile number 9717161185, used to access the internet banking facility of M/s Sabir Enterprise two days before the fraud, is registered in the name of Raju Kumar Manjhi with his presence in Gurgaon and Kolkata corroborated through CDRs, Blinkit logs etc. Mobile number 9717161185 is linked to a Blinkit account in the name of Raju, with the delivery address recorded as 18/43, 2nd Floor, Room No. 12, U Block, DLF Phase 3, Sector 24, Gurugram, Haryana, for the period from 11 .11 .2023 to 27.04.2024 which include fraud period. The house owner has also been examined who confirmed that Raju Kumar Manjhi used to live at this address during the relevant period.”

4. In fact, the very same charge-sheet, *interestingly* also records that further investigation is to continue only in respect of other suspected persons and other victims, in the following terms:

“16.55 That further investigation regarding other suspected persons and in respect of the remaining eight victims shall continue under Section 193(9) BNSS. A supplementary final report shall be filed upon completion of such further investigation. It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon’ble Court may kindly permit continuation of investigation in the interest of justice.”

**[Emphasis Supplied]**

5. Cognizance thereon was taken by the learned ACJM-08<sup>5</sup> vide order dated 17.02.2026 and summons were issued to the applicant. Pursuant

---

<sup>5</sup> Hereinafter referred to as “Magistrate”



thereto, the application seeking bail of the applicant was dismissed *vide* order dated 29.05.2026 by the learned Magistrate. This has resulted in the applicant being sent to Judicial Custody.

6. Thereafter, the applicant moved another bail application before the learned Sessions Court which also came to be dismissed *vide* order dated 06.06.2026.

7. In these facts, this Court has heard learned senior counsel for the applicant and the learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI.

8. *Admittedly*, as evident from the records before this Court, the investigating agency itself never considered it necessary to arrest the applicant during the entire course of investigation and the applicant was only taken into custody post rejection of his bail application, and that too only after filing of the charge-sheet and cognizance being taken thereon. As such, the applicant was never arrested prior to the filing of the charge-sheet. In view thereof, mere not joining investigation in compliance of two notices by the applicant is not such a relevant factor. It was open for the investigating agency to have taken recourse to the coercive measures available in law for securing presence of the applicant if it was so significant, more so, whence the applicant herein is not named in the FIR and limited/ no-direct role (as reproduced in para no.3 above) has been ascribed to him in the charge-sheet.

9. In fact, recently the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Musheer Alam vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr.***<sup>6</sup> has held as under:

*“8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there is a practice in the State of Uttar Pradesh*

---

<sup>6</sup> SLP(Crl.) No.18081/2024



*that arrest is effected after the charge-sheet is filed and the court takes cognizance of the charge-sheet. We do not propose to say anything as regards in this unusual practice except that it makes no sense.*

9. *We are of the view that once the investigation is over and charge-sheet is filed then the accused should be asked to appear before the Court concerned and should furnish bail to the satisfaction of the trial court.*

10. *If at all, the Investigating Officer wanted to interrogate the petitioner, he could have arrested him during the course of the investigation itself. Now there is no point in making a formal arrest.”*

10. In the wake of the above, though CBI has sought to contend that further investigation *qua* the present applicant is ongoing and there may be a requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant, considering the nature of the charge-sheet filed, the same cannot be a sole ground for denial of regular bail to the applicant herein.

11. In such circumstances, for the purposes of the present application wherein the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail, the contents of the charge-sheet already filed are of significant relevance, more so, since cognizance has also been taken thereon. That the applicant himself appeared before the learned Magistrate pursuant to issuance of summons is also a vital factor for consideration for grant bail. Moreover, as borne out from the records, the whole case of the prosecution substantially hinges/ rests on documentary and electronic evidence(s), all of which are already seized and is/ are in the custody of the investigating agency, and there hardly being any scope for the applicant to tamper with it/ them. Further, it is informed that other co-accused persons who have been attributed comparatively more



significant role have already been granted bail.

12. Accordingly, for the reasons above, and since it is a settled position of law that the purpose/ object of bail is to secure the presence of the applicant during trial, the present application is allowed.

13. Resultantly, the applicant be released on regular bail in proceedings arising out of FIR No.RC2212024E0022 dated 07.12.2024 registered at PS: EO-III, Delhi under *Sections 120B/170/419/420/343/346/388 IPC* and *Section 66D* of the IT Act, subject to him furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- [*Rupees Fifty Thousand Only*] along with one surety of the like amount by a family member/ friend having no criminal case pending against him/ her and further subject to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent, and further subject to the following conditions:

- i. Applicant shall not leave NCT of Delhi without prior permission of this Court and shall ordinarily reside at the address as per prison records. If he wishes to change his residential address, he shall immediately intimate about the same to the IO by way of an affidavit.
- ii. Applicant shall surrender his Passport, if any, to the IO, within a period of *three days*.
- iii. Applicant shall appear before the Court as and when the matter is taken up for hearing.
- iv. Applicant shall provide all his mobile numbers to the IO concerned which shall be kept in working condition at all times and shall not be switch off or change the mobile number without prior intimation to the IO concerned.
- v. Applicant shall report to the IO at PS: EO-III, Delhi once every



month in the first week of the month unless leave of every such absence is obtained from the learned Trial Court.

vi. Applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not communicate with or come in contact with any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.

14. The present application is disposed of with the aforesaid terms.

15. Copy of this judgment be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.

16. Needless to say, expression of view(s) on the merits involved, if any, are solely for the purposes of adjudication of the present bail application and shall have no bearing on the overall case/ trial involved.

**SAURABH BANERJEE, J.**

**JULY 06, 2026/AB**