



\$~5 & 6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ BAIL APPLN. 2451/2025 and CRL.M.A. No. 19324/2025 and
CRL.M.(BAIL) 1436/2025

RENU

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

Versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State
with SI Nitin Kumar, PS- Farsh Bazar.

Mr. Shahid ali, Mr. Sameer Tayyb, Mr. Mohd.
Salman and Mr. Ahmed Saeed, Advocates for R2

6

+ BAIL APPLN. 2467/2025 and CRL.M.A. No. 19410/2025 and
CRL.M.A. 19411/2025

PRADEEP

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

Versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State
with SI Nitin Kumar, PS- Farsh Bazar.

Mr. Shahid ali, Mr. Sameer Tayyb, Mr. Mohd.
Salman and Mr. Ahmed Saeed, Advocates for R2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

04.11.2025

%

1. Present petitions have been filed by petitioners under Section 482 read with Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.0367/2023, P.S. Farsh Bazar, under Section 420/506/34 IPC.
2. Previous two order sheets dated 09.07.2025 and 18.08.2025 reveal that there was no representation on behalf of petitioners. Even today, there



is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners.

3. Perusal of order dated 21.01.2025 passed in Bail Appl. 2589/2024 and connected matter shows that similar petitions seeking anticipatory bail were earlier filed by the petitioners and the same came to be dismissed by this Court vide said order.

4. It appears that thereafter the order dated 21.01.2025 was assailed by petitioners by preferring an SLP (Crl.) Diary no. 23704/2025. The said SLP was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court *vide* order dated 09.05.2025, observing as under:

“2. Having considered the matter(s) in its entirety and taking into account the stand of learned counsel for the complainant, who appeared suo motu in the present case and assisted the Court by reading out the relevant portion of the agreement for sale, which indicates that the possession of the ground floor was handed over by the petitioner to the complainant in lieu of initial payment of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs) at the time of the agreement, we do not find any ground to interfere with the order(s) impugned.”

5. This Court is of the view that once anticipatory bail of the petitioners has been dismissed on merits by this Court, which order was affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, present petitions again seeking anticipatory bail in connection with same FIR, are not maintainable.

6. Accordingly, petitions along with pending applications, are dismissed.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 4, 2025/jg