$~6 & 7

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 3142/2025 & CRL.M.A. 24397/2025

ALLADI RAJA SAI .....Applicant

Through: Mr. Amit Chadha, Senior Advocate with Mr. Shubham Seth, Mr. Rohit Singh, Ms. Neha Kumari, Mr. Rahul Vats, Mr. Harjas Singh and Ms. Supriya, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTOR OF ENFORCEMENT .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anurag Jain, Advocate.

\+ BAIL APPLN. 3343/2025 & CRL.M.A. 26077/2025

MOHIT SINGH .....Applicant

Through: Mr. Arshdeep Singh Khurana and Mr. Kedar Goswami, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anurag Jain, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

O R D E R

% **15.10.2025**

1. The present applications are filed by the applicants seeking regular bail in ECIR/HIU-1/7/2024 dated 28.03.2024 registered by the Directorate of Enforcement. The ECIR finds its genesis from the two cases registered by the Central Bureau of

Investigation in respect of predicate offences being RC No. 2212022E0041 dated 26.08.2022 registered under Sections 420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('**IPC**') and Sections 66C/66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 ('**IT Act**') and RC No. 2212023E0036 dated 27.12.2023 registered under Sections 403/420/120B of the IPC and Section 66D of the IT Act.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that upon the examination of RC No. 2212023E0036 registered by CBI, it was found that 937 bank accounts maintained with HDFC bank were used for topping up *Pyypl Wallet*/Virtual Card *etcetera*. Further, on investigation, it was found that out of the 937 bank accounts, 12 bank accounts were managed, operated and controlled by a group of individuals namely – Ajay, Vipin Yadav, Bhaskar Yadav, Ashok Kumar Sharma, Lalit Goel and Rahul Ujjainwal against whom 16 cyber fraud related complaints were received on National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal.

3. On the basis of the complaints made to the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal in respect of the aforesaid 12 bank accounts, it was noticed that the money was initially collected from the complainants/victims in the name of fake investment schemes, false jobs, and the illicit money so generated were received in mule accounts. Thereafter, the funds received in mule accounts were rotated through a web of entities. Subsequently, it is alleged that in order to obliterate the chain and the origin of the proceeds of crime, the proceeds were further layered through said bank accounts managed and controlled by individuals namely – Ajay, Vipin Yadav, Bhaskar Yadav, Ashok Kumar Sharma, Lalit Goel and Rahul Ujjainwal who formed part of '*bijwasan group.*'

Thereafter, the *bijwsasan group* knowingly withdrew the tainted money in Dubai or uploaded on *Pyypl Wallet* for the purchase of crypto currency.

4. On further investigation, it was revealed that the *bijwasan group* were operating from Bijwasan area of New Delhi and the said group of individuals collectively created a web of entities which were managed, operated and controlled by them for carrying out various transactions regarding uploading the money on *Pyypl Wallet.*

5. On further analysis regarding the source of fund in the bank account of entities managed, operated and controlled by the group of individuals comprising Ajay, Vipin Yadav, Bhaskar Yadav, Ashok Kumar Sharma, Lalit Goel and Rahul Ujjainwal, it was noticed that the said group of individuals received funds from accused Rohit Aggarwal (main accused) and other individuals namely Chhotu Singh, Jitendra Kaswan and Rakesh Karwa.

6. It is alleged that the accused persons duped and cheated the Indian citizens for a sum of ₹641 crores in the name of fake investment schemes false jobs and other similar activities.

7. The scrutiny of the of the bank accounts revealed that out of the proceeds of crime of ₹248.48 crore, an amount of around ₹50.91 crore was transferred to the bank account of co-accused namely – Rohit Aggarwal, who further transferred a sum of ₹17.74 crore in the entities managed and controlled by applicant Alladi Raja Sai. Additionally, proceeds of crime to the tune of ₹1.30 crore were transferred in the same bank accounts by co-accused Rakesh Karwa and a sum of ₹2.82 crore was transferred

in the said bank accounts by co-accused Chottu Singh Gurjar. In addition to the same, a sum of ₹2.10 crore was received by the applicant Alladi Raja Sai directly from the mule bank accounts. The allegations against the applicant Alladi Raja Sai are that he was actively involved in layering the proceeds of crime by creating and managing business entities for laundering the money in the garb of buying cryptocurrency. The applicant Alladi Raja Sai is stated to be a resident of Dubai and is also stated to be managing business entities namely - M/s Zook Logistics Pvt. Ltd., M/s Niyo Global Carrerz Pvt. Ltd., M/s Arunachal Shiva Construction Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Om Sai Transport. It is alleged that colossal credits were received in multiple bank accounts of these business entities and the same were converted into Cryptocurrency. In aggregate, the inflows mapped to the applicant Alladi Raja Sai and his entities stand at ₹23.98 crore. The applicant Alladi Raja Sai was arrested on 10.02.2025.

8. The allegations against the applicant Mohit Singh are that he was instrumental in arranging mule bank accounts in lieu of commission. It is alleged that the applicant Mohit Singh admitted that out of the total 216 mule bank accounts, the applicant Mohit Singh arranged 20 mule bank accounts for collecting illicit funds in exchange for commission. It is also alleged that the applicant was maintaining two bank accounts in HDFC Bank wherein there were total credits of more than ₹2.50 crores. The applicant Mohit Singh was arrested on 29.01.2025.

9. The learned counsel for the applicants submit that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. They submit that the applicants have not been

named in the FIRs for the predicate offences and they have no nexus with the alleged predicate offences and did not play any role in the generation of the proceeds of crime. They submit that the role attributed to the applicants is not graver than the other co-accused persons who were admitted on bail by this Court by judgment dated 26.09.2025 in BAIL APPLN. 1763/2025; BAIL APPLN. 1780/2025 and BAIL APPLN. 2257/2025. They consequently submit that the present applicants be also admitted on bail on the ground of parity.

10. *Per contra,* the learned counsel for the respondent vehemently opposes the grant of any relief to the applicants. He submits that the allegations against the applicants are serious in nature. He submits that the cheated amount in the present case is to the extent of ₹641 crores. He submits that the applicant Alladi Raja Sai was actively involved in the layering the proceeds of crime by creating and managing business entities for laundering the money in the garb of buying cryptocurrency. He submits that the applicant Mohit Singh was involved in arranging mule accounts wherein large proceeds of crime were collected in lieu of commission.

11. I have heard the counsel and perused the record.

12. The prosecution has emphasised on the magnitude of the victims that were duped into investing massive amounts on different premises by using a complex mechanism that involved multiple layers of technology. It is the case of the prosecution that post the collection of a sufficient corpus, the funds were routed through mule accounts and withdrawn at overseas locations. The role attributed to the present applicants is

summarised as under:

13. **Applicant Alladi Raja Sai :** It is alleged that the applicant was actively involved in laundering the proceeds of crime with the help of various business entities namely - M/s Zook Logistics Pvt. Ltd., M/s Niyo Global Carrerz Pvt. Ltd., M/s Arunachal Shiva Construction Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Om Sai Transport. It is alleged that massive credits were received in multiple bank accounts of these business entities and the same were converted into Cryptocurrency. It is alleged that accused Rohit Aggarwal (main accused) transferred a sum of ₹17.74 crore in the entities managed and controlled by applicant Alladi Raja Sai. Additionally, proceeds of crime to the tune of ₹1.30 crore were transferred in the same bank accounts by co-accused Rakesh Karwa and a sum of ₹2.82 crore was transferred in the said bank accounts by co-accused Chottu Singh Gurjar. A sum of ₹2.10 crore was received by the applicant directly from the mule bank accounts. In aggregate, the total inflow to the applicant's account and the entities managed by him are to the tune of ₹23.98 crore.

14. **Applicant Mohit Singh :** It is alleged that the applicant was involved in providing mule accounts where large proceeds of crime were collected. It is alleged that the applicant took money for providing the mule bank accounts and also received commission for the transactions carried out in those accounts. It is alleged that the applicant admitted that out of the total 216 mule bank accounts, the applicant arranged 20 mule bank accounts for collecting illicit funds in exchange for commission. It is also alleged that the on the scrutiny of the bank accounts maintained by the applicant, it was found that there were total

credits of more than ₹2.50 crores.

15. From the record, it transpires that the role attributed to the applicants is not graver than the accused persons who were admitted on bail by judgment dated 26.09.2025 in BAIL APPLN. 1763/2025; BAIL APPLN. 1780/2025 and BAIL APPLN. 2257/2025.

16. This Court had admitted the co-accused persons on bail noting the allegations and material on record. The role attributed to the applicants cannot be said to be graver than that of the accused Rohit Aggarwal, whose custody concededly was not found relevant by the prosecution. It is pertinent to note that the accused Rohit Aggarwal was arraigned as Accused No. 4 in the prosecution complaint and he had allegedly received ₹50.01 crores in his bank account out of the total proceeds of crime amounting to ₹248.48 crores. It is alleged that out of the amount so received, the accused Rohit Aggarwal had transferred a sum of ₹25.19 crores to the bank accounts of various entities, which were managed and controlled by Bhaskar Yadav, Ashok Kumar Sharma, Ajay and Vipin Yadav along with their associates. It is alleged that accused Rohit Aggarwal had also transferred a sum of ₹17.74 crore in the entities managed and controlled by applicant Alladi Raja Sai. It is further alleged that the accused Rohit Aggarwal was assisting the syndicate by arranging mule accounts and exchanging the said funds into crypto currency.

17. This Court *vide* judgment dated 26.09.2025 had noted that though some of the accused persons including the applicants were arrested, the prosecution complaint was filed without finding any need to arrest the accused Rohit Aggarwal. The role

of the accused Rohit Aggarwal was in fact found much graver than the other accused persons. This Court consequently held as under:

> *"**33.** Prima facie, from the allegations and the material on record, it appears that the applicants Ajay and Vipin are at the penultimate rung of the transaction while the accused Rohit is also alleged to be privy to the collection of proceeds of crime by the organised crime syndicate. Their role cannot be said to be graver than that of the said accused. Insofar as the applicant Rakesh is concerned, it is pertinent to note that as per the case of the respondent department that is borne out from the complaints, the funds received by the applicant Rakesh were transferred to various individuals/ entities, including the accused Rohit, and the crypto currency received from the said individuals used to be further transferred by the applicant Rakesh into private wallets. At best, the role of the applicant Rakesh can be stated to be similar to that of the accused Rohit. Despite the same, while the applicants have been arrested, the prosecution complaint (wherein the co-accused Rohit was arraigned as an accused) was filed on 25.01.2025 without arresting the said accused.*
>
> ***34.** It is contended on behalf of the respondent department that the applicants cannot claim parity with accused Rohit Aggarwal as he had extended full cooperation by voluntarily disclosing his bank accounts, crypto wallets, mule entities and modus operandi of laundering while the applicants had evaded queries and concealed records. It is argued that the applicant Rakesh had evaded summons as well.*
>
> ***35.** The said assertions have been convincingly controverted by the applicants and it has been pointed out that the alleged disclosures that merited the accused Rohit not being arrested were made after the arrest of the applicants Ajay and Vipin and 29.11.2024. It has been pointed out that the applicants made significant disclosures in relation to the crypto trade and also provided details of crypto wallets amongst other things.*
>
> ***36.** Although the issue of whether the applicants rendered necessary cooperation prior to their arrest is a largely subjective one, it cannot be ignored that the applicant Rakesh has made similar disclosures akin to the ones made by the accused Rohit and the applicants Ajay and Vipin were arrested before the relevant disclosures, as*

pointed out by the prosecution to show the said accused person's cooperation, were made by the accused Rohit.

37. *Reliance has also been placed by the respondent department on the judgment in the case of CBI v. V. Vijay Sai Reddy : (2013) 7 SCC 452 to contend that the circumstance of not arresting the other accused itself cannot be a ground to grant bail. In the said case, the Hon'ble Apex Court was considering a challenge to the dismissal by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh for cancellation of bail granted to the respondent therein. In this context, the Hon'ble Apex Court noted that that the learned Special Judge while granting bail to the respondent therein seemed to have been weighed by certain irrelevant factors such as another accused not being arrested. The Hon'ble Apex Court, while cancelling the bail of the respondent therein, took note of the role ascribed to him, which had been asserted to be that of the "brain behind the alleged offence of huge magnitude" and consequently observed that such an assertion could not be taken lightly in view of the materials relied upon by the investigating agency. It is however pertinent to note that the Hon'ble Apex Court in the said case had not propounded that the circumstance of another accused not being arrested cannot be considered while considering the question of bail. It appears that in the facts of that particular case, the Hon'ble Apex Court had simply found that the other accused not being arrested was an irrelevant consideration considering the gravity of role of the respondent therein.*

38. *The said decision cannot be read into the facts of the instant case as, prima facie, the role attributed to the applicants cannot be stated to be graver than that of the accused Rohit Aggarwal as it is the prosecution's case that majority of the funds came from him. Furthermore, as pointed out, even Mr. Vikas Saini, who is extensively referred in the complaint as having assisted the applicant Rakesh in arranging the mule accounts, has neither been made an accused and nor arrested in the present case, which further weighs in favour of the applicants."*

18. This Court also took note of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Himansh alias Himanshu Verma v. Directorate of Enforcement* : 2024 SCC OnLine SC 4697**, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court had enlarged the accused therein on bail on the sole ground that the mastermind of the

alleged offence had never been arrested. Non-arrest of similarly placed co-accused persons has been considered to be a significant factor to grant concession of bail to an accused. This Court, therefore, held as under:

> *"**39.** Recently, in the case of Himansh alias Himanshu Verma v. Directorate of Enforcement : 2024 SCC OnLine SC 4697, the Hon'ble Apex Court had enlarged the accused therein on bail on the sole ground that the mastermind of the alleged offence had never been arrested in the case. Non-arrest of similarly placed co-accused persons has been considered to be a significant factor by Coordinate Benches of this Court to grant concession of bail to an accused as well [Ref. Bindu Rana v. Serious Fraud Investigation Office : BAIL APPLN. 3643/2022; Ramesh Manglani v. ED : (2023) 7 HCC (Del) 134; Sanjay Kansal v. Enforcement Directorate : 2024 SCC OnLine Del 9569; etc]. The said precedents clearly reflect that the relevance of selective prosecution by the investigating agency, which is manifestly arbitrary, cannot be discounted while considering the question of grant of bail.*
>
> ***40.** Having not arrested an accused who appears to have a graver role than the applicants and not even arraigned a person named to have facilitated in arranging the mule accounts, the approach adopted by the respondent department prima facie appears to be manifestly arbitrary and the benefit of parity cannot be denied to the applicants.*
>
> ***41.** It is also relevant to note that the investigation in the predicate offence has not yet concluded and the present matter is still at the stage of cognizance, even though the applicants Ajay and Vipin were arrested way back on 29.11.2024 and the applicant Rakesh was arrested on 29.01.2025. It is argued that there are 76 witnesses in the first prosecution complaint and 35 witnesses in the supplementary prosecution complaint, whereby, it is highly unlikely that the trial will conclude in an expeditious manner.*
>
> ***42.** It is pointed out that over 1000 documents have been made part of the case record, which will require a lot of time for examination. Even as per the respondent department, the investigation is still continuing and the same is likely going to take a long time to conclude."*

19. The role attributed to co-accused Vipin and Ajay in BAIL

APPLN. 1763/2025 and BAIL APPLN. 1780/2025 respectively were that they knowingly assisted in the concealment of proceeds of crime to the tune of ₹21.02 crores by routing the same through their own bank account and the bank accounts of various entities, and further converting the proceeds into cryptocurrency or through overseas cash transactions. Further, the role attributed to co-accused Rakesh Karwa in BAIL APPLN. 2257/2025 was that he was involved in arranging 186 mule accounts for the members of organised criminal syndicate who are operating through telegram groups in exchange of a fixed percentage of the total credit amount as commission and that he knowingly assisted in the acquisition of proceeds of crime to the tune of ₹170.31 crores.

20. Considering the arbitrary mechanism adopted by the prosecution in cherrypicking the arrest of the accused persons and taking note of the fact that the investigation in the predicate offences had not yet concluded and that the matter was still at the stage of cognizance, this Court had enlarged the co-accused persons on bail *vide* judgment dated 26.09.2025 in BAIL APPLN. 1763/2025; BAIL APPLN. 1780/2025 and BAIL APPLN. 2257/2025.

21. Additionally, it is also pertinent to note that the investigation in the predicate offence has not yet concluded. Further, in the present case as well, even though the complaint has been filed, the cognizance has still not been taken. It is also pointed out that over 1000 documents have been made a part of the case record which will require a lot of time for examination. Moreover, even as per the respondent department, the

investigation is still ongoing and the same is likely going to take a long time to conclude. In such circumstances, the trial is not likely to commence or conclude in the near future.

22. The applicant Alladi Raja Sai was arrested on 10.02.2025 and the applicant Mohit Singh was arrested on 29.01.2025.

23. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India v. K.A. Najeeb*** **: AIR 2021 SC 712**, while dealing with an application for bail under Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, has held that once it is obvious that a timely trial would not be possible, and the accused has suffered incarceration for a significant period of time, the courts would ordinarily be obligated to enlarge them on bail.

24. In the cases of ***Mohd. Muslim v. State (NCT of Delhi)*****: (2023) 18 SCC 166** and ***Rabi Prakash v. State of Odisha*** **: 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1109**, while dealing with the bar under Section 37 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 which is analogous to Section 45 of the PMLA, the Hon'ble Apex Court had observed that prolonged incarceration overrides the twin conditions as it mutilates against the fundamental right of an individual under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

25. Although it is argued that the *modus* employed by the accused persons is complex which requires time for investigation, however, the prosecution cannot be allowed to endlessly detain the accused persons. In the case of ***V. Senthil Balaji v. State*** **: 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2626**, the Hon'ble Apex Court had observed as under:

> *"25.* ***Considering the gravity of the offences in such statutes, expeditious disposal of trials for the crimes under***

__these statutes is contemplated.__ Moreover, such statutes contain provisions laying down higher threshold for the grant of bail. The expeditious disposal of the trial is also warranted considering the higher threshold set for the grant of bail. Hence, the requirement of expeditious disposal of cases must be read into these statutes. Inordinate delay in the conclusion of the trial and the higher threshold for the grant of bail cannot go together. It is a well-settled principle of our criminal jurisprudence that "bail is the rule, and jailis the exception." __These stringent provisions regarding the grant of bail, such as Section 45(1)(iii) of the PMLA, cannot become a tool which can be used to incarcerate the accused without trial for an unreasonably long time__.

26. There are a series of decisions of this Court starting from the decision in the case of K.A. Najeeb, which hold that such stringent provisions for the grant of bail do not take away the power of Constitutional Courts to grant bail on the grounds of violation of Part III of the Constitution of India. We have already referred to paragraph 17 of the said decision, which lays down that the rigours of such provisions will melt down where there is no likelihood of trial being completed in a reasonable time and the period of incarceration already undergone has exceeded a substantial part of the prescribed sentence. One of the reasons is that if, because of such provisions, incarceration of an undertrial accused is continued for an unreasonably long time, the provisions may be exposed to the vice of being violative of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

27. __Under the Statutes like PMLA, the minimum sentence is three years, and the maximum is seven years. The minimum sentence is higher when the scheduled offence is under the NDPS Act. <u>When the trial of the complaint under PMLA is likely to prolong beyond reasonable limits, the Constitutional Courts will have to consider exercising their powers to grant bail.</u> The reason is that Section 45(1)(ii) does not confer power on the State to detain an accused for an unreasonably long time, especially when there is no possibility of trial concluding within a reasonable time.__ What a reasonable time is will depend on the provisions under which the accused is being tried and other factors. One of the most relevant factor is the duration of the minimum and maximum sentence for the offence. Another important consideration is the higher threshold or stringent conditions which a statute provides for the grant of bail. Even an outer limit provided by the relevant law for the completion of the trial, if any, is also a factor to be considered. The extraordinary powers, as held in the case of

K.A. Najeeb, can only be exercised by the Constitutional Courts. The Judges of the Constitutional Courts have vast experience. Based on the facts on record, if the Judges conclude that there is no possibility of a trial concluding in a reasonable time, the power of granting bail can always be exercised by the Constitutional Courts on the grounds of violation of Part III of the Constitution of India notwithstanding the statutory provisions. The Constitutional Courts can always exerciseits jurisdiction under Article 32 or Article 226, as the case may be. The Constitutional Courts have to bear in mind while dealing with the cases under the PMLA that, except in a few exceptional cases, the maximum sentence can be of seven years. ***The Constitutional Courts cannot allow provisions like Section 45(1)(ii) to become instruments in the hands of the ED to continue incarceration for a long time when there is no possibility of a trial of the scheduled offence and the PMLA offence concluding within a reasonable time.*** *If the Constitutional Courts do not exercise their jurisdiction in such cases, the rights of the undertrials under Article 21 of the Constitution of India will be defeated. In a given case, if an undue delay in the disposal of the trial of scheduled offences or disposal of trial under the PMLA can be substantially attributed to the accused, the Constitutional Courts can always decline to exercise jurisdiction to issue prerogative writs. An exception will also be in a case where, considering the antecedents of the accused, there is every possibility of the accused becoming a real threat to society if enlarged on bail. The jurisdiction to issue prerogative writs is always discretionary."*

(emphasis supplied)

26. Placing reliance on the aforesaid judgment, in the case of ***Anwar Dhebar v. Directorate of Enforcement*** **: S.L.P. (CRIMINAL) NO(S). 3592/2025**, where the investigation was in process and cognizance had not been taken, the Hon'ble Apex Court had granted bail to the accused therein after nine months of custody on account of there being no possibility that the trial will commence in the near future. The relevant portion of the order is as under:

"*In connection with the earlier ECIR concerning the same* *subject-matter, the appellant has been in custody for 80 days. As far as the present ECIR and complaints are concerned, the appellant was arrested on 8th August, 2024. So far 03 supplementary complaints have been filed in addition to the original complaint. 40 witnesses have been cited.* ***The investigation is in progress****. In the predicate offence, there are 450 witnesses and the investigation is in progress.* ***Cognizance has not been taken****.*

Therefore, there is no possibility of the trial commencing in near future. *The maximum sentence is of 07 years. Following the law laid down by this Court in the case of V. Senthil Balaji vs. The Deputy Director, Directorate of Enforcement [2024 INSC 739], the appellant is entitled to be enlarged on bail pending the trial on appropriate stringent terms and conditions especially when, except for the predicate offence, there are no antecedents of the appellant brought on record.*"

(emphasis supplied)

27. From the foregoing, it is evident that despite the stringent requirements imposed on the accused under Section 45 of PMLA for the grant of bail, it has been established that these requirements do not preclude the grant of bail on the grounds of undue delay in the completion of the trial. Various courts have recognized that prolonged incarceration undermines the right to life and liberty, as has been guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, and therefore, conditional liberty must take precedence over the statutory restrictions under Section 45 of PMLA and override the bar therein.

28. From a perusal of the material on record and the allegations levelled, it is apparent that the role attributed to the applicants is not graver than the accused persons who have already been admitted on bail by this Court. Moreover, as noted above, the trial has not even commenced and is therefore not likely to conclude in the near future. The applicants are therefore

entitled for bail on the ground of parity.

29. In view of the above, the present applications are allowed and the applicants are directed to be released upon them furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹1 lakh each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, subject to following terms and conditions:

a. The applicants shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;

b. The applicants shall under no circumstance leave the country without the permission of the learned Trial Court;

c. The applicants shall co-operate in further investigation, if any;

d. The applicants shall appear before the learned Trial Court on every date of hearing, unless their appearance is exempted;

e. The applicants shall provide the addresses where they would be residing after their release and shall not change the address without informing the concerned IO;

f. The applicants shall, upon their release, give their mobile number to the concerned IO and shall keep their mobile phone switched on at all times;

30. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry / complaint

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

31. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are for the purpose of deciding the present bail applications and should not influence the outcome of the trial and not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

32. The present bail applications are allowed in the aforementioned terms. Pending application also stands disposed of.

33. A copy of the order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 15, 2025

DU