



\$~16

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 574/2026**
SHAKTI SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. K.K. Manan, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Udit Bali, Mr. K.S.
Choudhary, Mr. Ankur Rana &
Mr. Ritik Sharma, Advocates.

versus

STATE(NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for
State.
Insp. Vijay Pal Dahiya & SI
Anurag Tyagi, PS SR/Crime
Branch.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
23.03.2026

%

BAIL APPLN. 574/2026

1. By way of this application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 361/2025, dated 29.09.2025, registered at Police Station Greater Kailash, under Sections 329(4)/62/336(3)/340(2)/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. The applicant was granted interim protection *vide* order dated 10.02.2026, recording as follows:

“3. The FIR, registered at the instance of Respondent No. 2, concerns a dispute over property bearing No. E-76, Greater Kailash Part-I, New Delhi. Respondent No. 2, the complainant, claims to be the owner of the property, and that it was gifted to him by his father-in-law. The allegations in the FIR have their genesis in a public notice published in a newspaper on 10.09.2025, in which one Mr.



Vineet Kumar Saigal claims to be the owner of the property. The present applicant was not named in the FIR.

4. However, it is stated that the petitioner was named in a disclosure statement of a co-accused, Mr. Ashish Chaudhary, an advocate, who claimed that the applicant had introduced him to the aforesaid Mr. Vineet Kumar Saigal and instructed him to facilitate mutation of the disputed property.

5. The applicant's application for anticipatory bail before the Sessions Court, was opposed by the prosecution, by filing a status report dated 31.01.2026. The status report has been placed on record with the present application.

6. In the status report filed before the learned Sessions Court, the role of the present applicant is stated to be as follows:

a. The petitioner introduced co-accused Mr. Ashish Chaudhary to co-accused Mr. Vineet Kumar Saigal, who is a friend and neighbour of the present applicant.

b. The applicant corresponded with Mr. Ashish Chaudhary, on behalf of Mr. Vineet Kumar Saigal.

c. The applicant accompanied Mr. Vineet Kumar Saigal to the office of the Crime Branch on 22.01.2026 and was questioned regarding the relationship between him and Mr. Ashish Chaudhary.

d. During investigation, the call detail records of Mr. Ashish Chaudhary and Mr. Vineet Kumar Saigal were obtained, and it was found that Mr. Ashish Chaudhary and the present applicant had spoken 24 times during the period from 14.07.2025 to 14.08.2025. Further, the location of Mr. Ashish Chaudhary was found in the apartment complex where the applicant resides on 17 occasions, between 30.06.2025 and 17.08.2025.

7. The learned Sessions Court has proceeded on the basis of these allegations, and dismissed the application for anticipatory bail vide order dated 31.01.2026.

8. Before this Court, however, Mr. Singh submits, upon instructions from the Investigating Officer, that the contents of the status report filed before the Sessions Court were partly inaccurate. The number of visits of Mr. Ashish Chaudhary to the aforesaid residential complex was, in fact, 4 visits between the period from 30.06.2025 and 17.08.2025, and not 17.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that this is an appropriate case to grant interim protection to the applicant. There is no allegation that the applicant himself is concerned with the disputed property, or that there was any financial transaction from which he benefited. The only allegation is that he introduced Mr. Vineet Kumar Saigal to an advocate, Mr. Ashish



Chaudhary. The position of the present applicant is that Mr. Ashish Chaudhary was also his lawyer, which is a plausible explanation for the telephone calls between them. The fact that there were a large number of calls does not, by itself, justify depriving the applicant of his liberty at this stage. The number of visits of Mr. Ashish Chaudhary to the same location has also not been correlated with the commission of the offence by the applicant. As stated above, both the applicant and the co-accused reside in the same apartment complex, and there is no material to show that Mr. Ashish Chaudhary was visiting the residence of the present applicant.

10. For the aforesaid reasons, subject to the applicant joining investigation as and when called upon by the IO, it is directed that he will not be arrested until the next date of hearing.”

11. Mr. Aashneet Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, states, upon instructions, that the complainant has been informed by Insp. Vijay Pal Dahiya, Investigating Officer [“IO”], about the pendency of the bail application in terms of order dated 10.02.2026.

12. Mr. Singh submits that the applicant has since joined the investigation, and no allegation of non-cooperation is made out against him. Although the charge sheet has not yet been filed, no requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant is asserted at this stage.

13. It is also stated that the applicant is not involved in any other case.

14. Having regard to the grounds noted in the order dated 10.02.2026, and the aforesaid submissions, the application is disposed of with the direction that, in the event the applicant is arrested in connection with FIR No. 361/2025, dated 29.09.2025, registered at Police Station Greater Kailash, he will be released on bail, subject to furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/-, and one surety in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the IO/concerned Station House Officer, and subject to the following further conditions:



- a. The applicant will report to the IO as and when required, and will cooperate in the investigation.
 - b. The applicant will furnish his mobile number to the IO, and shall keep the said mobile phone running and always switched on. The mobile number shall not be changed or switched off without prior intimation to the IO.
 - c. The applicant will give his residential address to the IO, and will not change his residential address without prior intimation to the IO.
 - d. The applicant shall not directly/indirectly try to get in touch with the complainant and his family or tamper with the evidence.
 - e. The applicant shall not commit any offence during pendency of these proceedings.
15. The bail application is disposed of in these terms.
16. It is clarified that the observations made herein are solely for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, nor shall they prejudice the rights and contentions of the parties at any stage of the proceedings.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 23, 2026

'pv'/AD/