$~95

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 774/2026

ABDUL HAKKIM M @ SATHIK SYED .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. M. P. Srivignesh, Mr. Manu Srinath, Mr. Mithun Kumaar N., Mr. Gokul Athithya R.P., Advocates

versus

THE STATE GNCT OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State with Inspector Sanjay Panghal, P.S. IGI Airport.

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

O R D E R

% **29.04.2026**

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 739/2025, registered at Police Station IGI Airport, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 318(4)/336(3)/340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter *'BNS'*) and Section 12 of the Passports Act, 1967.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 28.10.2025, three passengers, namely Naveenraj Subramaniyam, Mohan Gandhi Elangovan, and Prabhakaran Senthilkumar, had approached the immigration counter for departure to Paris, France (Flight No. AI-143). Upon scrutiny, their French D-type visas were found to be counterfeit. Accordingly, the present FIR was registered and investigation was taken up.

3. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that the fake visas had been arranged by co-accused Kannan (Tamil Nadu) and the present applicant/accused Abdul Hakim @ Sathik Syed (Madurai), who had allegedly lured the victims on the false pretext of providing employment in France. It is stated that an amount of approximately ₹28 lakhs had been paid by the victims in this regard. Co-accused V. Kannan was arrested on 11.11.2025 and, during interrogation, disclosed that the funds had been routed to the present applicant, Abdul Hakim @ Sathik Syed, as well as to SP Education & Career Solutions and Senthil Hariharasudan. Financial trail analysis had corroborated the transfer of approximately ₹20.5 lakhs to the applicant, along with other amounts to his associates. Thereafter, the present applicant surrendered on 17.12.2025 after rejection of his anticipatory bail application and was arrested. He allegedly disclosed the involvement of co-accused Rajesh and Senthil, who allegedly had orchestrated the scheme and arranged the forged visas. It is stated that co-accused Senthil is presently absconding in France, while Rajesh is residing in Cambodia, against whom a Look Out Circular has been issued. The charge sheet has been filed; however, further investigation is stated to be continuing to trace the remaining accused persons and to ascertain the source of the forged visas.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no connection with the main accused or the alleged offence. It is contended that the role attributed to the applicant is limited, as he is alleged to have merely acted as an intermediary in facilitating a financial transaction, without any active involvement in the commission of the offence. It is further submitted that co-accused persons with a similar role have already been granted bail,

and the case of the present applicant stands on a similar footing. The learned counsel also submits that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 17.12.2025, for more than four months, and that the investigation *qua* him stands concluded with the filing of the charge sheet. It is thus argued that his continued incarceration is not necessary, and he be granted regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the State opposes the bail application, and argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is contended that the applicant has played an active role in the commission of the offence and is, in fact, the main accused. It is further submitted that during investigation, it has been revealed that co-accused V. Kannan had transferred an amount of ₹20.5 lakhs to the present applicant for arranging counterfeit visas. It is also pointed out that two co-accused persons are still absconding and investigation qua them is ongoing. In such circumstances, it is argued that there is a likelihood of the applicant interfering with the investigation or influencing the course of inquiry if released on bail. It is thus prayed that the present bail application deserves to be dismissed.

6. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel appearing for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State, and has perused the material available on record.

7. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the material on record, this Court notes that the allegations in the present case pertain to a scheme whereby the victims were induced, on the false pretext of providing overseas employment, to pay substantial amounts for arranging visas, which were later found to be counterfeit.

8. This Court notes that during the course of investigation, it has emerged that the fake visas had been arranged through a network of accused

persons, including the present applicant. The financial trail placed on record shows that an amount of ₹20.5 lakhs (approximately) had been transferred by co-accused V. Kannan to the present accused/applicant in connection with arranging the said visas. At this stage, the material on record *prima facie* shows a nexus between the applicant and the alleged offence.

9. This Court further notes that the investigation is still ongoing, particularly with respect to two co-accused persons who are stated to be absconding and operating from foreign jurisdictions. The nature of the allegations indicates a larger conspiracy involving multiple persons across different locations. In such circumstances, there exists a reasonable apprehension that, if released on bail, the applicant may interfere with the investigation, influence witnesses, or hamper efforts to unearth the full extent of the conspiracy.

10. Considering the nature and seriousness of the allegations, the role attributed to the applicant, and the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant at this stage.

11. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.

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

13. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

APRIL 29, 2026/*GJ*