



\$~3

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

CNR No. DLHC010159092026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1478/2026**

MAHTAB KHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Md. Mohd.
Asif, Mr. Kadir Ali and Ms. Farheen
Khan, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **19.08.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present application has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the 'BNSS'), seeking grant of anticipatory bail in **FIR No. 483/2025**, registered at Police Station Prasad Nagar, Delhi, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4)/336(3)/340(2)/338/331(3)/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the 'BNS').
3. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Ms. Manjeet Kaur Kaila in relation to a dispute concerning ownership of property bearing No. 6038/4, Second Floor, Block No. 2, Dev Nagar, Karol Bagh, Delhi. During inquiry, it was found that the complainant as well as Neha and Alpana Sarkar were claiming ownership of the said property. Investigation revealed an alleged forged chain of documents showing transfer of the



property from the complainant to Vinod Kumar, thereafter to Mohd. Arsh and subsequently to Neha and Alpana Sarkar.

4. The petitioner was not named in the FIR and his name surfaced during investigation on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Vinod Kumar. The prosecution alleges that the petitioner had arranged the persons who subsequently became part of the alleged forged chain of documents.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a civil suit has already been filed by the complainant and a copy thereof has been placed on record. He further submits that the petitioner has been named only on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused and there is no incriminating evidence against him. He submits that the petitioner has already been granted interim protection by this Court *vide* order dated 17.04.2026 and, therefore, he be granted anticipatory bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State submits that the petitioner has filed an incorrect affidavit before this Court with regard to his criminal antecedents. It is submitted that the petitioner has disclosed only one case against him, whereas there are five cases registered against him, including a case relating to fake currency and another under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as '*IPC*'). He further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, *inter alia*, for obtaining his voice sample.

7. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State and perused the material placed on record.

8. The allegations against the present petitioner are quite heinous. During investigation, it has come on record that the complainant had never visited India in the year 2011 when the GPA was executed in favour of co-accused



Vinod Kumar.

9. It has further come to light that there are various telephonic conversations between the petitioner and the subsequent purchaser, and, therefore, the voice sample of the petitioner is required for the purposes of investigation. Not only this, the petitioner has also not correctly disclosed his criminal antecedents before this Court.

10. Therefore, in such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

13. It is clarified that nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

14. The order be uploaded on the website *forthwith*.

MADHU JAIN, J

AUGUST 19, 2026/prg/Av