



\$~53

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1931/2025**

RAVINDER KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manoj Godara, Advocate

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the
State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

20.05.2025

BAIL APPLN. 1931/2025

1. Issue notice. Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for State, accepts notice. A copy of the reply has been handed over across the Board and is taken on record.
2. This is the second bail application filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (formerly Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) seeking pre-arrest bail in proceedings arising from FIR No. 2/2025 registered under Sections 318(4)/336(3)/340(2)/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at P.S. Dwarka North.
3. The Applicant's first bail application was rejected by this Court on 1st May, 2025, in BAIL APPLN. 1686/2025. Barely 19 days later, the Applicant has once again approached this Court, contending that the primary



reason for dismissal i.e. non-cooperation with the investigation, was based on an incomplete presentation of facts. It is now asserted that the Applicant did, in fact, join the investigation but was forcibly taken to the police station without prior service of a notice under Section 35 of the BNSS. This is evident from the video footage annexed with the application. This fact could not be placed before the Court earlier as he did not possess the video footage at the time. The Applicant further alleges that police recorded his statement under coercion and that a backdated notice under Section 35 of BNSS was subsequently handed over to him, followed by another notice requesting document production. He also claims that he was compelled to pay money to police officials for his release and the Investigating Officer¹ made a false statement before this Court that the Applicant is not co-operating. He further denies allegations made by the Investigating Officer about destruction of documents, terming them baseless and fabricated.

4. Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for State, informs the Court that the Applicant had failed to respond to calls and notice, prompting the IO to visit the CSC Centre and request his presence at the police station for investigation and submission of relevant documents. The Applicant accompanied the IO but declined to provide a statement, stating that he would do so in the presence of his family. His relatives later came to the police station with ASI Virender (an officer allegedly known to the Applicant), who conveyed that the Applicant's wife was unwell and requested one week's time to submit the required documents along with the Applicant's written statement. On this assurance, a notice under Section 94 of BNSS was served on 15th April, 2025, in the presence of the Applicant's

¹ "IO"



relatives, with a deadline of 25th April, 2025, for producing documents.

5. The Court has considered the afore-noted contentions.

6. As noted in the earlier order, the allegations against the Applicant are serious in nature, involving the fabrication of government identity documents, the alleged use of forged signatures and stamps of a former MLA, and misuse of official machinery. The investigation is at a nascent stage, and the material collected thus far points to the Applicant's role in the alleged conspiracy. The reasons for dismissing bail on merit already been discussed in the previous order and need not be reiterated.

7. The Applicant's current allegations against the IO remain unsubstantiated. Notably, no formal complaint has been filed by the Applicant before any authority to substantiate the claim of coercion, illegal detention, or forced payment. Further, the assertion that a backdated notice was served is contradicted by the facts narrated by the APP that the notice under Section 94 of BNSS was handed over in the presence of relatives and ASI Virender.

8. The Court also notes that the Applicant has not demonstrated any substantial change in circumstances between the dismissal of the earlier bail application and the present one. The video footage now relied upon at best, amounts to a disputed factual assertion, which is not sufficient to disregard the reasoning of the previous order.

9. The Court, therefore, finds no reason to depart from the conclusions reached in its previous order dated 1st May, 2025, as no new grounds have been established to warrant a different view.



10. In view of the above, the application is dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 20, 2025/ab