



\$~13

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 428/2026**

RANJEET

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Suraj Prakash Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State.
SI Ankesh, Aman Vihar.
Mr. Ankit Mann, Ms. Jyoti Shokeen,
Advocates for complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

09.07.2026

1. The instant application has been filed on behalf of the applicant under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**) r/w Section 528 of the BNSS seeking grant of regular bail in relation to FIR No.550/2024 registered at PS Aman Vihar *qua* the offence punishable under Sections 420/406/34/467/468/471/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**).
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the instant case and is innocent. According to him, the property was shown to be belonging to one Vipin. He also submits that the applicant is in jail since 20.04.2025 and has already



suffered more than 15 months incarceration. The investigation is complete; charge sheet has been filed but the charges have not yet been framed and the trial will take sufficient time in its completion.

3. The said submissions are strongly opposed by learned APP for the State, who contends that besides the instant case, there is another case registered against the applicant bearing FIR No.361/2024 for almost similar offence. It is contended that the applicant has fabricated the document in the name of Vipin. It is, thus, contended that bearing in mind the gravity of the offence, the applicant should not be enlarged on bail.

4. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. The prosecution case would indicate that at the instance of complainant, an FIR was registered. The complainant alleged that Rahul approached her at her work place and induced her to purchase the property in question. Through accused Rahul, the complainant was introduced to co-accused Vipin Kumar. It is alleged the co-accused Vipin in connivance with the present applicant and Rahul, forged the title documents of a plot situated at C-Block, Rama Vihar, Mohammadpur Majri, Delhi, falsely projecting himself as the owner, and, thereafter, sold the said property to the complainant for a total consideration of Rs.14,50,000/-.

6. The Court finds that the main accused namely Vipin, who has shown to be the owner of the property, has expired. Against Rahul as well as the present applicant, the charge sheet has already been filed; the matter is fixed for framing of charges; the custodial interrogation of the applicant is no more required and he has already suffered about 5 months incarceration.

7. Bearing in mind all the aforesaid aspects, the Court deems it



appropriate to enlarge the present applicant on regular bail. The Court, therefore, directs for the release of the applicant on regular bail subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the concerned Trial Court.

8. In view of the aforesaid, the instant application along with the accompanying applications stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 9, 2026

Nc