



\$~77

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 870/2026 & CRL.M.A. 6719/2026**

MAULESH PATEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aaditya Gore, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **27.02.2026**

CRL.M.A. 6720/2026 & CRL.M.A. 6721/2026 (exemption)

23. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

24. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 870/2026

25. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 187/2025, registered at Police Station Crime Branch, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 318/319(2)/336/340(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Section 12 of the Passport Act, 1976.

26. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.

27. Briefly stated the facts of the present case as per the case of the prosecution is that on the basis of the secret information, the present FIR was registered against one Nirav Kumar Babulal who is a resident of Gujarat



for possession of fake passport and visa of Canada. After he was apprehended, detailed interrogation revealed the identity of the present accused and it transpired that co-accused Nirav Kumar had paid an amount of Rs. 40,00,000/- to the present accused/applicant for facilitating his journey to Canada. During investigation it was found that the passport jacket was changed and the details of the original passport holder were ascertained. The investigation further revealed that the details and photographs appearing on the Aadhaar Card and PAN Card did not match with the details on passport and its particulars mentioned on it.

28. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant states that there is no incriminating material on record against the applicant and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is also stated that the applicant herein has joined the investigation in the present case. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

29. The learned APP, on the other hand, opposes the present application for grant of anticipatory bail and argues that the accused has co-operated in the investigation despite service of notice and the process under Section 84 of BNS already stands initiated. It is also argued that the custodial interrogation of the accused is required for the purpose of ascertaining the money trail and the modus operandi adopted for commission of the offence in question.

30. This Court has heard the arguments addressed on behalf of the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State.

31. After hearing arguments and going through the case file and material available on record, this Court is of the opinion that co-accused Nirav Kumar Babulal was found in possession of the fake passport and visa of



Canada and the investigation had revealed that the original passport in the case belonged to one Mohan, however, as per investigation, the present accused/applicant was paid Rs. 40,00,000/- by co-accused Nirav Kumar Babulal who had changed the jacket of the passport. Further, a report has been received from the Embassy of Canada regarding the visa being in the name of another passenger and not in the name of Nirav Kumar Babulal. The Call Detail Records (CDRs) clearly indicate the connectivity between co-accused Nirav Kumar Babulal and the present accused/applicant. Therefore, in this Court's opinion, the custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant will be required to ascertain the modus-operandi adopted for changing the details, the passport jacket etc., and issuance of fake visa and passport by the present accused/applicant. Further the computer and printer used by the present accused/applicant is to be recovered along with the money paid for preparing fake visa and passport.

32. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, no ground for anticipatory bail is made out in the present case and the present application is accordingly rejected.

33. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

34. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2026/vc