



\$~5

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 615/2025

RAUSHAN KUMAR MEHTA

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Moinuddin
Cutlerywala along with M.
Vaibhav Dubey, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State.
SI Nagendra Kumar, Anti
Narcotics Squad, South
East, New Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

25.03.2025

%

1. By present application, the applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No. 807/2023, dated 02.11.2023, registered at Police Station Okhla Industrial Area under Sections 420/468/471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'). The chargesheet has been filed under Sections 420/467/468/471/34/120-B of the IPC.
2. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by a company, namely– M/s Sahil Exports Private Limited in regard to fraudulent withdrawal of money from their accounts. It is alleged that a sum of ₹50 lakhs was fraudulently transferred into the company bank account of M/s Development Electronic Automation Technology Private Limited, which was operated by the applicant. The said amount was transferred using forged NACH mandate of the complainant company, with the help of other co-accused persons.



3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged transactions.

4. He submits that co-accused, namely– Mukhtiar Singh was granted bail *vide* order dated 05.01.2024 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, South East Dist., Saket Courts, New Delhi, and two more co-accused persons namely–Vinod Kumar Bharti and Shanawaz Khan have been granted bail *vide* order dated 07.12.2024 passed by the learned Magistrate, South East Dist., Saket Courts, New Delhi.

5. He submits that the applicant is a young man of 25 years of age and is in custody since 26.11.2023. He submits that the investigation *qua* the applicant is complete, the chargesheet has already been filed and the applicant is not required for any custodial interrogation.

6. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State opposed the grant of the present bail application. He submits that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature.

7. He submits that incriminating electronic and documentary evidence against the accused has been seized and information regarding his associates has been received during investigation. He further submits that the investigation has unravelled a syndicate nexus targeting multiple bank accounts using fraudulent means, and in this regard, a comprehensive investigation involving the applicant and his associates is required.

8. After the completion of investigation, the chargesheet has already been filed before the learned Trial Court, and now the matter is listed for arguments on charge. It is apparent that the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time. Therefore,

BAIL APPLN. 615/2025

Page 2 of 6



this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant in further incarceration.

9. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in the case of **Sanjay Chandra v. CBI : (2012) 1 SCC 40**, emphasized that the purpose of pre-trial detention is not punitive and held as under:

*“21. In bail applications, generally, it has been laid down from the earliest times that the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. **The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment, unless it is required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty.***

*22. From the earliest times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. **From time to time, necessity demands that some unconvicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, “necessity” is the operative test.** In this country, it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances.*

*23. Apart from the question of prevention being the object of refusal of bail, one must not lose sight of the fact that **any imprisonment before conviction has a substantial punitive content and it would be improper for any court to refuse bail as a mark of disapproval of former conduct** whether the accused has been convicted for it or not or to refuse bail to an unconvicted person for the purpose of giving him a taste of imprisonment as a lesson.*

xxx

27. This Court, time and again, has stated that bail is the rule and committal to jail an exception. It has also observed that refusal of bail is a restriction on the personal liberty of the individual guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.

xxx

40. The grant or refusal to grant bail lies within the discretion of the court. The grant or denial is regulated, to a large extent, by the facts and circumstances of each



particular case. But at the same time, right to bail is not to be denied merely because of the sentiments of the community against the accused. The primary purposes of bail in a criminal case are to relieve the accused of imprisonment, to relieve the State of the burden of keeping him, pending the trial, and at the same time, to keep the accused constructively in the custody of the court, whether before or after conviction, to assure that he will submit to the jurisdiction of the court and be in attendance thereon whenever his presence is required.

xxx

43. There are seventeen accused persons. Statements of witnesses run to several hundred pages and the documents on which reliance is placed by the prosecution, are voluminous. The trial may take considerable time and it looks to us that the appellants, who are in jail, have to remain in jail longer than the period of detention, had they been convicted. It is not in the interest of justice that the accused should be in jail for an indefinite period. No doubt, the offence alleged against the appellants is a serious one in terms of alleged huge loss to the State exchequer, that, by itself, should not deter us from enlarging the appellants on bail when there is no serious contention of the respondent that the accused, if released on bail, would interfere with the trial or tamper with evidence. We do not see any good reason to detain the accused in custody, that too, after the completion of the investigation and filing of the charge-sheet.

xxx

46. We are conscious of the fact that the accused are charged with economic offences of huge magnitude. We are also conscious of the fact that the offences alleged, if proved, may jeopardise the economy of the country. At the same time, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the investigating agency has already completed investigation and the charge-sheet is already filed before the Special Judge, CBI, New Delhi. Therefore, their presence in the custody may not be necessary for further investigation. We are of the view that the appellants are entitled to the grant of bail pending trial on stringent conditions in order to allay the apprehension expressed by CBI.”

(emphasis supplied)

10. In the present case, the applicant was arrested way back on 26.11.2023 and has spent substantial period of time in custody. Given that there are around 24 witnesses, speedy trial in the present case does not seem to be possible. The trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time to conclude. The applicant

BAIL APPLN. 615/2025 Page 4 of 6



cannot be made to spend the entire period of trial in custody especially when the trial is likely to take considerable amount of time.

11. In view of the above, the applicant is admitted on bail in the present FIR, on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court on the following conditions:

- a. The applicant shall appear before the learned Trial Court on every date of hearing;
- b. The applicant shall join for further investigation, if any, as and when called by the Investigating Officer (IO) concerned;
- c. The applicant shall, upon his release, provide his mobile number to the IO concerned, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The applicant shall not switch off, or change the same without prior intimation to the IO concerned, during the period of bail;
- d. The applicant shall, upon his release, provide his address to the IO concerned and shall not change the same without informing the IO;
- e. The applicant shall not leave the country during the bail period and shall surrender his passport before the concerned Trial Court.

12. It is pointed out that the applicant at this moment is in custody in some other case in Taloja Central Jail, Thane, Maharashtra. The present order shall not be taken as an order of release of the applicant in any other case.

13. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry/ complaint
BAIL APPLN. 615/2025

Page 5 of 6



lodged against the applicant, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

14. The bail application is allowed in the aforementioned terms.

15. It is made clear that any observations made in the present order are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and should not influence the outcome of the trial.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 25, 2025

“SK”