IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 8260 of 2026

Ankit Dubey, aged about 28 years, son of Umesh Kr. Dubey @ Duvedi, resident of Khandbari Wahnia, P.O. and P.S. Bachuwa, District Chandoli, U.P. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opp. Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. P.P.N. Roy, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Zaid Ahmed, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, APP
Ms. Malti Pathak, AC to PP

06/8th September 2026

1. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Sahibganj (T) P.S. Case No. 34 of 2026 for the offence registered under Sections 338, 336(3), 340(2), 316(2), 318(4) & 319(2) of BNS and Sections 66(B), 66(C), 66(D) of IT Act, now said to have been pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sahibganj.

2. ***Learned senior counsel for the petitioner*** submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR, rather the petitioner is a victim. The petitioner happens to be the treasurer of Maa Savitri Trust and his brother is one of the trustee. On 07.02.2026, the brother of the petitioner made a request to the bank to close down the account on the ground that certain fraudulent activities were going on in his account. Thereafter, the brother of the petitioner also lodged a complaint of the cyber-crime incident stating that he had lost his SIM on 06.02.2026. This complaint was made and acknowledgement number dated 07.02.2026 was also generated. Apparently, the account of the trust was hacked and huge amount was transacted through the account of the trust. As per the RBI circular, the burden of proving customer's liability in case of unauthorized electronic banking transaction is on the bank and the liability of the customer is zero. The petitioner is in custody since 10.04.2026. The charge has also been framed on 27.08.2026. The learned senior counsel submits that not a single penny has been withdrawn by the petitioner from the account of the trust.

3. ***Learned counsel for the State***, while opposing the prayer for bail, has submitted that the petitioner as well as his brother is accused in the present case and during the period from 01.01.2026 to 06.02.2026, there has been transaction of Rs. 4.41 crores and Odd in the bank account and on 06.02.2026 only meagre amount was left. The learned counsel has referred to the case-diary to submit that the petitioner, his brother and the co-accused were constantly in touch with each other and were involved in commission of cyber-crime. The present case is a case of digital arrest of the informant and huge amount has been siphoned off. It is also a case of organized crime.

4. ***After hearing the learned counsel for the parties***, this Court finds that the statement of account of Maa Savitri Trust has been placed on record, which reflects huge transaction in the account on 06.02.2026 and huge amount has been siphoned off from the account on the same day. The complaint was lodged by the brother of the petitioner on the next date to close the account i.e. on 07.02.2026 by stating that his SIM was lost on 06.02.2026.

5. The allegation in the FIR reveals that the informant, namely, Sunil Kumar Bhartiya is alleged to have received a phone call on 29.01.2026 and 30.01.2026 enquiring about a SIM card purchased by him using his Aadhar Card from Mumbai on 24.12.2025 and it was also told that one FIR was lodged in Mumbai against him and there was a scam of transaction relating to 538 crores. The informant responded that since last 10 years he had not visited Mumbai. Thereafter he was told that CBI would do the necessary enquiry and thereafter he was digitally arrested and cheated to the extent of Rs. 80,09,974/-.

6. The allegation against the petitioner is that different bank account numbers were used for illegal transaction and during such verification, the account of Maa Savitri Trust also surfaced and CDR report reveals that the accused persons were in regular touch with each other during the occurrence of cyber fraud. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other co-accused digitally arrested the informant and he was intimidated into believing that he is under official custody/investigation via calls/video calling and ultimately he was cheated a huge sum of money.

7. Considering the nature of the allegations and the huge amount involved in the cyber fraud committed after digitally arresting the informant and the transactions have been linked with the account of Maa Savitri Trust where huge transaction, deposits and withdrawal, have taken place in the account of Maa Savitri Trust, and the case is of organised crime this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is hereby ***rejected***.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'e-mail/FAX'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 08.09.2026
Uploaded On: 08.09.2026
Mukul/-