

53 Bail Matters 12/2026
STATE Vs. Deepanshu
FIR No.363/2025 (Crime Branch-North Delhi)

08.01.2026

This is an application under section 480 of BNSS seeking grant of regular bail to the applicant/accused Deepanshu.

Present : L.d. APP for the State.

Sh. Gurmukh Singh Arora, L.d. Counsel for
applicant/accused Deepanshu through VC.

1. Today, matter is listed for orders on the bail application of applicant/accused.

Brief Facts:

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2025 at about 12:18 AM, SI Arvind Kumar (Crime Branch, AEKC) along with police staff conducted a raid at Flat No. 8-187, Luxury Heights, Gulabi Bagh/Model Town area, Delhi, on the basis of secret information regarding an illegal call centre. During the raid, the police apprehended accused/applicant and six others, who were found operating a fake Apple Support call centre.

3. It is alleged that they were cheating US citizens by receiving calls through toll-free numbers generated in the name of Apple Support, misleading victims into granting remote access via Screen Connect and coercing them to purchase bitcoins/cryptocurrency which were transferred to wallets controlled by their associates Rajesh, Rudra and Aryan.

4. During search, several laptops, mobile phones and electronic devices used for the illegal activities were recovered. Preliminary forensic examination revealed use of Micro SIP, Screen Connect applications, international numbers, audio clips and data indicating commission of cyber fraud. All accused persons along with seized devices were brought to Crime Branch, Sunlight Colony, for further investigation.

Bail Application & Arguments:

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused contended that the alleged raid was conducted on the basis of secret information, however, no DD entry was recorded in this regard, which renders the very foundation of the raid doubtful. He argued that there is no private complainant and the FIR has been registered solely at the instance of police officials. He pointed out that no independent public witness has been associated with or examined during the alleged raid nor is there any such witness to establish that the accused persons were found actually running or operating a call centre. On the contrary, the FIR itself records that the laptops were found in shut-down or non-operational condition.

6. He argued that the investigation conducted so far reveals that the prosecution case is primarily based on the disclosure statements of the accused persons, which have no independent evidentiary value. Admittedly, there is no identified victim, no complaint from any foreign citizen and no money trail

or proof of transfer of any cheated amount till date. He argued that the allegations of cheating have been levelled without specifying as to who has suffered wrongful loss or who has derived wrongful gain.

7. He argued that even assuming the prosecution version to be correct, there is no likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, as all witnesses are police officials and the alleged evidence is digital in nature, which has already been seized and secured. He argued that the applicant/accused is a young boy and a first-time offender and his continued incarceration would expose him to hardened criminals, causing irreparable harm. Hence, bail is prayed for.

Reply of Prosecution:

8. Reply to the application filed. The application has been opposed by the L.d. Addl. PP for the State and by the IO on the ground that the applicant/accused is involved in serious cyber offence. They contended that the investigation is at an initial stage and response from FBI is still awaited. It was also argued that the co-accused/owners of the alleged call centre are absconding and custodial detention of the applicant is necessary for effective investigation.

9. On query, the IO clarified that the response from FBI is awaited and is likely to take approximately 30-60 days. He also stated that only after receipt of the said response, the

-: 4 :-

alleged victims, if any, and the money trail, if any, can be identified.

Findings:

10. The FIR has been registered under sections 318(4), 319/61(2)/3(5) of the BNS. It is evident from the submissions made and the investigation conducted so far that, apart from the disclosure statements of the accused persons, there is no substantive material on record to show that the applicant/accused with other persons was running or operating any illegal call centre or that any offence of cheating has actually been committed. Till date, no victim has been identified, no complaint from any affected person has been received and no money trail or wrongful gain or loss has been established.

11. The victims are stated to be foreign citizens and the IO has also conceded that the response from FBI is still awaited and may take a considerable period of time and only thereafter the alleged victims or money trail, if any, can be ascertained.

12. Considering that the alleged evidence is digital in nature and has already been seized, the possibility of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses is minimal, particularly when all material witnesses are police officials or US citizens. The applicant/accused is a young person and stated to be a first-time offender and his continued incarceration at this stage would not serve the ends of justice, especially when the investigation is likely to take time to conclude.

-: 5 :-

13. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further judicial custody of the accused is not warranted.

14. So far as the contention regarding the absconding co-accused is concerned, the same cannot be treated as a determinative factor for rejection of bail. The alleged abscondence of other persons does not ipso facto establish the culpability of the present accused nor does it justify their continued judicial custody, particularly when no specific role, recovery or further custodial interrogation is shown to be required from them. The investigation qua the present accused is substantially documentary and digital in nature, which has already been secured. The investigating agency is at liberty to take all steps in accordance with law for tracing and apprehending the absconding co-accused, however, the liberty of the present accused cannot be curtailed merely on account of the alleged non-availability of other persons.

15. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, no purpose will be served by keeping him in JC. Accordingly, he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bonds and one surety (local of Delhi) bonds in sum of Rs. 50,000/-, subject to the conditions that :-

- i) He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing scrupulously;

-: 6 :-

- ii) He shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspected;
- iii) He shall provide his mobile number to the IO and keep it operational for all the time;
- iv) He shall not tamper with the evidence or influence/threat any witness;
- v) The applicant/accused shall intimate the court in advance in case of change of his residential address;
- vi) He shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the concerned court.
- vii) He shall join the further investigation, if any, as and when directed by the IO/SHO concerned.

16. Breach any of the abovesaid conditions shall entail cancellation of bail and IO may file appropriate application observing any breach by the applicant/accused. Accordingly, the application stands disposed off.

17. Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused and also be sent to Jail Superintendent for intimation to accused. Ahlmad is directed to put up bail order after 7 days if bail bonds are not furnished.

(Priyanka Rajpoot)
Chief Judicial Magistrate, North District,
Rohini Courts, Delhi/08.01.2026

54 Bail Matters 13/2026
STATE Vs. Mayank
FIR No. 363/2025 (Crime Branch-North Delhi)

08.01.2026

This is an application under section 480 of BNSS seeking grant of regular bail to the applicant/accused Mayank S/o Sh. Sunil Kumar.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Gurmukh Singh Arora, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused Mayank through VC.

1. Today, matter is listed for orders on the bail application of applicant/accused.

Brief Facts:

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2025 at about 12:18 AM, SI Arvind Kumar (Crime Branch, AEKC) along with police staff conducted a raid at Flat No. 8-187, Luxury Heights, Gulabi Bagh/Model Town area, Delhi, on the basis of secret information regarding an illegal call centre. During the raid, the police apprehended accused/applicant and six others, who were found operating a fake Apple Support call centre.

3. It is alleged that they were cheating US citizens by receiving calls through toll-free numbers generated in the name of Apple Support, misleading victims into granting remote access via Screen Connect and coercing them to purchase bitcoins/cryptocurrency which were transferred to wallets controlled by their associates Rajesh, Rudra and Aryan.

4. During search, several laptops, mobile phones and electronic devices used for the illegal activities were recovered. Preliminary forensic examination revealed use of Micro SIP, Screen Connect applications, international numbers, audio clips and data indicating commission of cyber fraud. All accused persons along with seized devices were brought to Crime Branch, Sunlight Colony, for further investigation.

Bail Application & Arguments:

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused contended that the alleged raid was conducted on the basis of secret information, however, no DD entry was recorded in this regard, which renders the very foundation of the raid doubtful. He argued that there is no private complainant and the FIR has been registered solely at the instance of police officials. He pointed out that no independent public witness has been associated with or examined during the alleged raid nor is there any such witness to establish that the accused persons were found actually running or operating a call centre. On the contrary, the FIR itself records that the laptops were found in shut-down or non-operational condition.

6. He argued that the investigation conducted so far reveals that the prosecution case is primarily based on the disclosure statements of the accused persons, which have no independent evidentiary value. Admittedly, there is no identified victim, no complaint from any foreign citizen and no money trail

or proof of transfer of any cheated amount till date. He argued that the allegations of cheating have been levelled without specifying as to who has suffered wrongful loss or who has derived wrongful gain.

7. He argued that even assuming the prosecution version to be correct, there is no likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, as all witnesses are police officials and the alleged evidence is digital in nature, which has already been seized and secured. He argued that the applicant/accused is a young boy and a first-time offender and his continued incarceration would expose him to hardened criminals, causing irreparable harm. Hence, bail is prayed for.

Reply of Prosecution:

8. Reply to the application filed. The application has been opposed by the L.d. Addl. PP for the State and by the IO on the ground that the applicant/accused is involved in serious cyber offence. They contended that the investigation is at an initial stage and response from FBI is still awaited. It was also argued that the co-accused/owners of the alleged call centre are absconding and custodial detention of the applicant is necessary for effective investigation.

9. On query, the IO clarified that the response from FBI is awaited and is likely to take approximately 30-60 days. He also stated that only after receipt of the said response, the

-: 4 :-

alleged victims, if any, and the money trail, if any, can be identified.

Findings:

10. The FIR has been registered under sections 318(4), 319/61(2)/3(5) of the BNS. It is evident from the submissions made and the investigation conducted so far that, apart from the disclosure statements of the accused persons, there is no substantive material on record to show that the applicant/accused with other persons was running or operating any illegal call centre or that any offence of cheating has actually been committed. Till date, no victim has been identified, no complaint from any affected person has been received and no money trail or wrongful gain or loss has been established.

11. The victims are stated to be foreign citizens and the IO has also conceded that the response from FBI is still awaited and may take a considerable period of time and only thereafter the alleged victims or money trail, if any, can be ascertained.

12. Considering that the alleged evidence is digital in nature and has already been seized, the possibility of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses is minimal, particularly when all material witnesses are police officials or US citizens. The applicant/accused is a young person and stated to be a first-time offender and his continued incarceration at this stage would not serve the ends of justice, especially when the investigation is likely to take time to conclude.

-: 5 :-

13. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further judicial custody of the accused is not warranted.

14. So far as the contention regarding the absconding co-accused is concerned, the same cannot be treated as a determinative factor for rejection of bail. The alleged abscondence of other persons does not ipso facto establish the culpability of the present accused nor does it justify their continued judicial custody, particularly when no specific role, recovery or further custodial interrogation is shown to be required from them. The investigation qua the present accused is substantially documentary and digital in nature, which has already been secured. The investigating agency is at liberty to take all steps in accordance with law for tracing and apprehending the absconding co-accused, however, the liberty of the present accused cannot be curtailed merely on account of the alleged non-availability of other persons.

15. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, no purpose will be served by keeping him in JC. Accordingly, he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bonds and one surety (local of Delhi) bonds in sum of Rs. 50,000/-, subject to the conditions that :-

- i) He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing scrupulously;

-: 6 :-

- ii) He shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspected;
- iii) He shall provide his mobile number to the IO and keep it operational for all the time;
- iv) He shall not tamper with the evidence or influence/threat any witness;
- v) The applicant/accused shall intimate the court in advance in case of change of his residential address;
- vi) He shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the concerned court.
- vii) He shall join the further investigation, if any, as and when directed by the IO/SHO concerned.

16. Breach any of the abovesaid conditions shall entail cancellation of bail and IO may file appropriate application observing any breach by the applicant/accused. Accordingly, the application stands disposed off.

17. Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused and also be sent to Jail Superintendent for intimation to accused. Ahlmad is directed to put up bail order after 7 days if bail bonds are not furnished.

(Priyanka Rajpoot)
Chief Judicial Magistrate, North District,
Rohini Courts, Delhi/08.01.2026

52 Bail Matters 11/2026
STATE Vs. Karan Kapoor
FIR No.363/2025 (Crime Branch-North Delhi)

08.01.2026

This is an application under section 480 of BNSS seeking grant of regular bail to the applicant/accused Karan Kapoor.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Gurmukh Singh Arora, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused Karan Kapoor through VC.

1. Today, matter is listed for orders on the bail application of applicant/accused.

Brief Facts:

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2025 at about 12:18 AM, SI Arvind Kumar (Crime Branch, AEKC) along with police staff conducted a raid at Flat No. 8-187, Luxury Heights, Gulabi Bagh/Model Town area, Delhi, on the basis of secret information regarding an illegal call centre. During the raid, the police apprehended accused/applicant and six others, who were found operating a fake Apple Support call centre.

3. It is alleged that they were cheating US citizens by receiving calls through toll-free numbers generated in the name of Apple Support, misleading victims into granting remote access via Screen Connect and coercing them to purchase bitcoins/cryptocurrency which were transferred to wallets controlled by their associates Rajesh, Rudra and Aryan.

4. During search, several laptops, mobile phones and electronic devices used for the illegal activities were recovered. Preliminary forensic examination revealed use of Micro SIP, Screen Connect applications, international numbers, audio clips and data indicating commission of cyber fraud. All accused persons along with seized devices were brought to Crime Branch, Sunlight Colony, for further investigation.

Bail Application & Arguments:

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused contended that the alleged raid was conducted on the basis of secret information, however, no DD entry was recorded in this regard, which renders the very foundation of the raid doubtful. He argued that there is no private complainant and the FIR has been registered solely at the instance of police officials. He pointed out that no independent public witness has been associated with or examined during the alleged raid nor is there any such witness to establish that the accused persons were found actually running or operating a call centre. On the contrary, the FIR itself records that the laptops were found in shut-down or non-operational condition.

6. He argued that the investigation conducted so far reveals that the prosecution case is primarily based on the disclosure statements of the accused persons, which have no independent evidentiary value. Admittedly, there is no identified victim, no complaint from any foreign citizen and no money trail

or proof of transfer of any cheated amount till date. He argued that the allegations of cheating have been levelled without specifying as to who has suffered wrongful loss or who has derived wrongful gain.

7. He argued that even assuming the prosecution version to be correct, there is no likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, as all witnesses are police officials and the alleged evidence is digital in nature, which has already been seized and secured. He argued that the applicant/accused is a young boy and a first-time offender and his continued incarceration would expose him to hardened criminals, causing irreparable harm. Hence, bail is prayed for.

Reply of Prosecution:

8. Reply to the application filed. The application has been opposed by the L.d. Addl. PP for the State and by the IO on the ground that the applicant/accused is involved in serious cyber offence. They contended that the investigation is at an initial stage and response from FBI is still awaited. It was also argued that the co-accused/owners of the alleged call centre are absconding and custodial detention of the applicant is necessary for effective investigation.

9. On query, the IO clarified that the response from FBI is awaited and is likely to take approximately 30-60 days. He also stated that only after receipt of the said response, the

-: 4 :-

alleged victims, if any, and the money trail, if any, can be identified.

Findings:

10. The FIR has been registered under sections 318(4), 319/61(2)/3(5) of the BNS. It is evident from the submissions made and the investigation conducted so far that, apart from the disclosure statements of the accused persons, there is no substantive material on record to show that the applicant/accused with other persons was running or operating any illegal call centre or that any offence of cheating has actually been committed. Till date, no victim has been identified, no complaint from any affected person has been received and no money trail or wrongful gain or loss has been established.

11. The victims are stated to be foreign citizens and the IO has also conceded that the response from FBI is still awaited and may take a considerable period of time and only thereafter the alleged victims or money trail, if any, can be ascertained.

12. Considering that the alleged evidence is digital in nature and has already been seized, the possibility of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses is minimal, particularly when all material witnesses are police officials or US citizens. The applicant/accused is a young person and stated to be a first-time offender and his continued incarceration at this stage would not serve the ends of justice, especially when the investigation is likely to take time to conclude.

-: 5 :-

13. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further judicial custody of the accused is not warranted.

14. So far as the contention regarding the absconding co-accused is concerned, the same cannot be treated as a determinative factor for rejection of bail. The alleged abscondence of other persons does not ipso facto establish the culpability of the present accused nor does it justify their continued judicial custody, particularly when no specific role, recovery or further custodial interrogation is shown to be required from them. The investigation qua the present accused is substantially documentary and digital in nature, which has already been secured. The investigating agency is at liberty to take all steps in accordance with law for tracing and apprehending the absconding co-accused, however, the liberty of the present accused cannot be curtailed merely on account of the alleged non-availability of other persons.

15. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, no purpose will be served by keeping him in JC. Accordingly, he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bonds and one surety (local of Delhi) bonds in sum of Rs. 50,000/-, subject to the conditions that :-

- i) He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing scrupulously;

-: 6 :-

- ii) He shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspected;
- iii) He shall provide his mobile number to the IO and keep it operational for all the time;
- iv) He shall not tamper with the evidence or influence/threat any witness;
- v) The applicant/accused shall intimate the court in advance in case of change of his residential address;
- vi) He shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the concerned court.
- vii) He shall join the further investigation, if any, as and when directed by the IO/SHO concerned.

16. Breach any of the abovesaid conditions shall entail cancellation of bail and IO may file appropriate application observing any breach by the applicant/accused. Accordingly, the application stands disposed off.

17. Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused and also be sent to Jail Superintendent for intimation to accused. Ahlmad is directed to put up bail order after 7 days if bail bonds are not furnished.

(Priyanka Rajpoot)
Chief Judicial Magistrate, North District,
Rohini Courts, Delhi/08.01.2026

51 Bail Matters 10/2026
STATE Vs. Aman Prasad
FIR No.363/2025 (Crime Branch-North Delhi)

08.01.2026

This is an application under section 480 of BNSS seeking grant of regular bail to the applicant/accused Aman Prasad.

Present : Ld. APP for the State.

Sh. Gurmukh Singh Arora, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused Aman Prasad through VC.

1. Today, matter is listed for orders on the bail application of applicant/accused.

Brief Facts:

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2025 at about 12:18 AM, SI Arvind Kumar (Crime Branch, AEKC) along with police staff conducted a raid at Flat No. 8-187, Luxury Heights, Gulabi Bagh/Model Town area, Delhi, on the basis of secret information regarding an illegal call centre. During the raid, the police apprehended accused/applicant and six others, who were found operating a fake Apple Support call centre.

3. It is alleged that they were cheating US citizens by receiving calls through toll-free numbers generated in the name of Apple Support, misleading victims into granting remote access via Screen Connect and coercing them to purchase bitcoins/cryptocurrency which were transferred to wallets controlled by their associates Rajesh, Rudra and Aryan.

4. During search, several laptops, mobile phones and electronic devices used for the illegal activities were recovered. Preliminary forensic examination revealed use of Micro SIP, Screen Connect applications, international numbers, audio clips and data indicating commission of cyber fraud. All accused persons along with seized devices were brought to Crime Branch, Sunlight Colony, for further investigation.

Bail Application & Arguments:

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused contended that the alleged raid was conducted on the basis of secret information, however, no DD entry was recorded in this regard, which renders the very foundation of the raid doubtful. He argued that there is no private complainant and the FIR has been registered solely at the instance of police officials. He pointed out that no independent public witness has been associated with or examined during the alleged raid nor is there any such witness to establish that the accused persons were found actually running or operating a call centre. On the contrary, the FIR itself records that the laptops were found in shut-down or non-operational condition.

6. He argued that the investigation conducted so far reveals that the prosecution case is primarily based on the disclosure statements of the accused persons, which have no independent evidentiary value. Admittedly, there is no identified victim, no complaint from any foreign citizen and no money trail

or proof of transfer of any cheated amount till date. He argued that the allegations of cheating have been levelled without specifying as to who has suffered wrongful loss or who has derived wrongful gain.

7. He argued that even assuming the prosecution version to be correct, there is no likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, as all witnesses are police officials and the alleged evidence is digital in nature, which has already been seized and secured. He argued that the applicant/accused is a young boy and a first-time offender and his continued incarceration would expose him to hardened criminals, causing irreparable harm. Hence, bail is prayed for.

Reply of Prosecution:

8. Reply to the application filed. The application has been opposed by the L.d. Addl. PP for the State and by the IO on the ground that the applicant/accused is involved in serious cyber offence. They contended that the investigation is at an initial stage and response from FBI is still awaited. It was also argued that the co-accused/owners of the alleged call centre are absconding and custodial detention of the applicant is necessary for effective investigation.

9. On query, the IO clarified that the response from FBI is awaited and is likely to take approximately 30-60 days. He also stated that only after receipt of the said response, the

-: 4 :-

alleged victims, if any, and the money trail, if any, can be identified.

Findings:

10. The FIR has been registered under sections 318(4), 319/61(2)/3(5) of the BNS. It is evident from the submissions made and the investigation conducted so far that, apart from the disclosure statements of the accused persons, there is no substantive material on record to show that the applicant/accused with other persons was running or operating any illegal call centre or that any offence of cheating has actually been committed. Till date, no victim has been identified, no complaint from any affected person has been received and no money trail or wrongful gain or loss has been established.

11. The victims are stated to be foreign citizens and the IO has also conceded that the response from FBI is still awaited and may take a considerable period of time and only thereafter the alleged victims or money trail, if any, can be ascertained.

12. Considering that the alleged evidence is digital in nature and has already been seized, the possibility of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses is minimal, particularly when all material witnesses are police officials or US citizens. The applicant/accused is a young person and stated to be a first-time offender and his continued incarceration at this stage would not serve the ends of justice, especially when the investigation is likely to take time to conclude.

-: 5 :-

13. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further judicial custody of the accused is not warranted.

14. So far as the contention regarding the absconding co-accused is concerned, the same cannot be treated as a determinative factor for rejection of bail. The alleged abscondence of other persons does not ipso facto establish the culpability of the present accused nor does it justify their continued judicial custody, particularly when no specific role, recovery or further custodial interrogation is shown to be required from them. The investigation qua the present accused is substantially documentary and digital in nature, which has already been secured. The investigating agency is at liberty to take all steps in accordance with law for tracing and apprehending the absconding co-accused, however, the liberty of the present accused cannot be curtailed merely on account of the alleged non-availability of other persons.

15. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, no purpose will be served by keeping him in JC. Accordingly, he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bonds and one surety (local of Delhi) bonds in sum of Rs. 50,000/-, subject to the conditions that :-

- i) He shall appear before the court on each and every date of hearing scrupulously;

-: 6 :-

- ii) He shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission of which he is suspected;
- iii) He shall provide his mobile number to the IO and keep it operational for all the time;
- iv) He shall not tamper with the evidence or influence/threat any witness;
- v) The applicant/accused shall intimate the court in advance in case of change of his residential address;
- vi) He shall not leave Delhi without prior permission of the concerned court.
- vii) He shall join the further investigation, if any, as and when directed by the IO/SHO concerned.

16. Breach any of the abovesaid conditions shall entail cancellation of bail and IO may file appropriate application observing any breach by the applicant/accused. Accordingly, the application stands disposed off.

17. Copy of order be given dasti to Ld. Counsel for accused and also be sent to Jail Superintendent for intimation to accused. Ahlmad is directed to put up bail order after 7 days if bail bonds are not furnished.

(Priyanka Rajpoot)
Chief Judicial Magistrate, North District,
Rohini Courts, Delhi/08.01.2026