



2026:DHC:6961



\$~66

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

%

Date of Decision: 20.08.2026

#

CNR No. DLHC010389192026

+

BAIL APPLN. 3443/2026 & CRL.M.A. 25651/2026

MOHD NAZIM KHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Ms. Nikita Rana,
Ms. Gurpreet Kaur and Mr. Aakash
Passi, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State
with SI Sumit.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case e-FIR No. 88/2026 of PS Special Cell for offence under Section 318(4)/319(2)/61(2)/3(5)/112(2) of BNS, Section 66D of Information Technology Act, Section 42 of Telecommunication Act and Section 4/20/25 of Indian Telegraph Act.

2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for the State assisted by Investigating Officer/SI Sumit.

3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is that



2026:DHC:6961



he provided and facilitated the illegal SIM Boxes and GSM Gateway devices for routing international VoIP calls into the Indian Telecom Network for helping the cyber fraudsters to carry out various cyber frauds, including digital arrests.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that accused/applicant was arrested on 13.04.2026 and chargesheet was filed on 04.06.2026. It is submitted that since the entire evidence is electronic, there is no need to further detain the accused/applicant in custody. It is submitted by learned counsel that nothing incriminating was recovered from the accused/applicant and he never visited Delhi.

5. Learned APP strongly opposes the bail application, submitting that as per investigation carried out, the accused/applicant is the key handler and operator, who facilitated installation and remote operation of the SIM Box through AnyDesk application. It is further submitted that according to the investigation carried out, the accused/applicant issued instructions to co-accused Anil Kumar and Vaibhav Raj, after supplying them SIM Cards through courier. It is further submitted by learned APP that according to the investigation record, the accused/applicant called the co-accused to Delhi and offered them to work for foreign-based operators after providing SIM Boxes, laptop and remotely controlled setups. Further, as per investigation, as many as 44 SIM Cards were recovered from his premises. Learned APP has also apprised that the accused/applicant was earlier also involved in a



2026:DHC:6961



similar offence pertaining to SIM Box, which was registered as FIR No. 4/2019 of PS ATS Mumbai. Since the accused/applicant, according to the investigation, has links with foreign-based handlers, it would not be proper to grant him bail as per learned Prosecutor. It is also submitted that during investigation, four SIM covers were recovered, all bearing the mobile phone number of the accused/applicant.

6. The nature of the offence, that too, a repeated offence is a vital factor to be kept in mind in the present case.

7. Going by the above described nature and expanse of the offence alleged against the accused/applicant, merely because the evidence to be adduced is electronic, the accused/applicant cannot rightfully claim grant of bail. Merely because the evidence is electronic, it cannot be said that the accused/applicant cannot tamper with the same. Looking into the technical profile of the accused/applicant, it is not impossible for him to tamper with the electronic evidence with the help of any remote software similar to AnyDesk as allegedly used by the accused/applicant.

8. I also find substance in the apprehension of the prosecution that in view of the connections between the accused/applicant and foreign-based handlers, as revealed during investigation, it cannot be said that he is not a flight risk.



2026:DHC:6961



9. Further, the Court also cannot ignore the impact of such crimes on society at large and specifically, economy of the country, already facing multiple cyber frauds, which are facilitated by such activities as are alleged against the accused/applicant.

10. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant bail. So the bail application and accompanying application are dismissed. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for being informed to the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 20, 2026/rs