



2026:DHC:910



\$~3

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

%

Date of Decision: 04.02.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2794/2025 & CRL.M.A. 21760/2025**

PANKAJ MUNDOTIYA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Kaushik, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF GNCTD

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The applicant/accused seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 60/2024 of Police Station Cyber Police, Dwarka for offence under Section 420/120B/34 IPC.

2. In furtherance of last order, prosecution filed updated status report disclosing further contours of the offence as well as further victims of the alleged cyber frauds.

3. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned prosecutor.



4. Broadly speaking, the prosecution case is as follows. On 11.06.2024, a complaint of Sh. Anil Kumar Meena was received alleging that on being induced by one Ravi Singh through a college WhatsApp group he invested Rs.16,56,000/- by way of transfers from his bank account. The complaint was registered as FIR after preliminary enquiry. In the course of investigation, further details of cyber fraud and siphoning off of the proceeds of cheating across different layers came to be revealed. The present accused/applicant falls in one such layer of the beneficiaries of the proceeds of the alleged frauds. A part of the proceeds of fraud was received by the accused/applicant in the bank account of his company. Further analysis of the bank account statement of the accused/applicant revealed that within a short span of 04 days from 06.05.2024 to 09.05.2024 more than Rs.13,00,000/- was credited into his bank account. The said credited amount was immediately debited through multiple transactions, reflecting suspicious financial activity and rapid layering of money. Further investigation revealed that against the bank account held by the company of the accused/applicant, 05 more online financial fraud complaints had been received and registered. One of those additional cyber fraud complaints pertains to Maharashtra and one each pertains to Gujarat and Karnataka. That would reflect the expanse of layering of the proceeds of crime.

5. Against the above backdrop, learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that the accused/applicant is, in fact, only a victim of the offence as he was not aware about the source of credit entries into his bank account. It is also contended that the allegedly cheated amount has been paid back by



the accused/applicant to the complainant. No other argument has been advanced.

6. On the other hand, learned prosecutor strongly opposes grant of anticipatory bail, submitting that despite service of notice, the accused/applicant has not joined investigation. It is also contended that in view of the nature and expanse of this crime, grant of anticipatory bail would not be appropriate as that would hamper investigation.

7. In the backdrop of overall circumstances of this case, the anticipatory bail cannot be granted merely because the accused/applicant had paid back a sum of Rs.30,000/- to the complainant *de facto* as submitted by learned counsel for accused/applicant. For, as described above, it is not a simple case of wrong advice of investments through WhatsApp group. According to investigation so far carried, there is a vast expanse of layering of the cyber fraud involving enormous amount and a number of victims across different States of the country.

8. Looking into the overall nature of the crime described above, the need expressed by the investigating officer for custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant does not appear to be unjustified. More so, because as mentioned above despite notice, the accused/applicant has not been joining investigation. Not only this, vide order dated 22.12.2022, even the predecessor bench, while extending the interim protection from arrest, had directed personal appearance of the accused/applicant in court on the next



date apparently, for certain clarifications, but the accused/applicant opted not to appear.

9. Considering the overall circumstances described above, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail.

10. Therefore, the anticipatory bail application and the accompanying application are dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

FEBRUARY 04, 2026/ry