



\$~1

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 151/2021 and CRL.M.A. 8693/2021**

SANDEEP KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nusrat Hassan and Ms. Sarv
Mangla, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (GNCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State
with Insp. G.N. Tiwari, PS-EOW Mandir Marg.
Ms. Nikita Dewan and Mr. Ayush Kumar,
Advocates for complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

13.11.2025

%

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 053/2018, under Section 420/406/120B IPC, registered at EOW, Mandir Marg.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with the co-accused Pankaj Kumar Agarwal and Pankaj Dayal approached the complainant company M/s. Blue Cloud Infra Pvt. Ltd. and instigated said company to invest money in land deal in the area of Village Jatti Kara, Tehsir, Kapashera, which their company namely M/s. Amenity Promoters Pvt. Ltd. was in the process of purchasing. On such inducement, the



complainant paid an amount of Rs.2.05 Cr. in cash and Rs.95 Lac through bank transfer.

3. Ms. Nusrat Hassan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner was a bodyguard of the main accused Pankaj Dayal and was inducted as Director on 29.03.2014. She submits that no payment was made by the complainant to the present petitioner. She further contends that a settlement has also been arrived at between main accused Pankaj Dayal as well as the complainant, in terms whereof, main accused has paid full and final settlement amount to the complainant.

4. On being queried by the Court Mr. Ayush Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. Shashank Dewan, learned counsel for the complainant, on instructions, fairly states that the settlement has been arrived at between co-accused and the complainant company and the payment has also been made.

5. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner had joined investigation after he was granted interim protection vide order dated 14.01.2021 as and when directed by the IO concerned.

6. IO of the case, who is present in Court, also states that the chargesheet has been filed against the present petitioner without arrest. Evidently, the petitioner is not required for any further investigation.

7. In that view of the matter, it is directed that in the event of petitioner's arrest, he may be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arrest officer/SHO/IO subject to the following conditions.

(a) The petitioner shall appear before the Court as and when the matter is taken up for hearing.



(b) The petitioner shall provide mobile number to the IO concerned which shall be kept in working condition at all times and he shall not change the mobile number without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer concerned.

(c) The petitioner shall not come in contact with the witnesses or tamper with any evidence.

8. It is clarified that the observations made hereinabove are only for the limited purpose of deciding the present bail application and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

9. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

10. Copy of the order be forwarded to the concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary compliance.

11. Pending application stands disposed of.

12. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 13, 2025/jg