



\$~57

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 639/2026**

JATIN KATYAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Digant Mishra, Mr. Abhinav
Deshwal, Ms. Kashmira Lambat, Ms.
Zainab Siddiqui, Ms. Anshul Rajora
and Ms. Sharvi Sharma, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State.
Mr. Puneesh Bahri, Adv. for
complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

17.02.2026

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out FIR bearing no. 388/2024, registered at Police Station Jagat Puri, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 420/468/471/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC').
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that the complainant had purchased a property bearing no. 6, First Floor, Gagan Vihar Extension, Delhi, from the mother of the applicant/accused *vide* a registered sale deed dated 15.06.2021 for a total consideration of ₹32,00,000/-. Thereafter, the complainant began residing in the said property. Subsequently, the



complainant received summons from the Court directing her to appear on 19.09.2023 in connection with a civil suit for eviction, dispossession, possession, and recovery of arrears of rent along with damages, filed by one Maneesh Kumar. Further, the complainant came to know that co-accused Maneesh Kumar had annexed with the plaint, a registered sale deed dated 21.12.2020, purportedly executed in his favour by the mother of the applicant herein. Thereafter, the complainant contacted the applicant and his mother to ascertain the veracity and authenticity of the alleged sale deed executed in favour of co-accused Maneesh Kumar, as well as the purported rent agreements relied upon by him. However, the complainant received no satisfactory explanation in this regard, whereupon she realised that she had been cheated. Consequently, the present FIR came to be registered

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no prior criminal antecedents. It is argued that the applicant had taken a loan of ₹25,00,000/- from co-accused Maneesh Kumar, and that Maneesh had fraudulently obtained the signatures of the applicant on the pretext of executing loan documents. It is further argued that the applicant has neither signed the sale deed registered in favour of co-accused Maneesh nor acted as a witness to the sale deed executed by the mother of the applicant. It is further argued that the present case is primarily based on documentary evidence and, therefore, there is no likelihood of the applicant tampering with evidence or influencing any witness. On these grounds, it is prayed that the applicant/accused be granted anticipatory bail.

4. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the State opposes the bail application and argues that the property in the name of the mother of the



applicant/accused was sold twice through duly registered sale deeds. It is further contended that a total consideration amount of ₹69,00,000/- was received from co-accused Maneesh Kumar in the bank account of the applicant herein. It is also argued that the mother of the applicant subsequently executed another sale deed in favour of the complainant. It is further contended that upon analysis of the bank account of the mother of the applicant, it was revealed that the consideration amount for the property was transferred to the bank account of the present applicant. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, it is prayed that the present bail application be dismissed.

5. The Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State, and has perused the material on record.

6. It is to be noted that the applicant herein had joined the investigation on one occasion and stated that his mother had sold the disputed property only to the complainant and not to co-accused Maneesh Kumar, and that he had no knowledge of any such transaction in favour of co-accused Maneesh Kumar. However, the investigation so far has revealed that the sale deed annexed with the plaint, by co-accused Maneesh Kumar, is a duly registered document and bears the signature of the applicant as a witness to the said sale. Further, during the course of investigation, it was revealed that the applicant/accused had received an amount of ₹69,00,000/- from co-accused Maneesh Kumar for which no explanation was forthcoming.

7. It is also pertinent to note that upon analysis of the bank account of the mother of the applicant/accused, it was revealed that the consideration amount for the said property was transferred from her bank account to the



bank account of the applicant.

8. Although the applicant herein seeks to contend that he had no knowledge of the sale of the property by his mother in favour of co-accused Maneesh Kumar, the presence of his signature as a witness on the sale deed relied upon by the co-accused, coupled with the transfer of a substantial amount into his bank account, *prima facie* indicates at this stage that the applicant was aware of the sale transaction between his mother and co-accused Maneesh Kumar. Despite such knowledge, the property in question was thereafter sold to the complainant for a consideration of ₹32,00,000/-.

9. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the failure of the applicant/accused to satisfactorily explain the financial transactions between him and co-accused Maneesh Kumar, coupled with the fact that the co-accused Maneesh Kumar has also not yet joined the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant the anticipatory bail to the applicant/accused.

10. The present bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

11. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2026/A

RB/GJ/AP