



\$~68

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 814/2025**

AWANEESH CHANDRA JHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shiv Upadhyay, Ms. Pooja Aggarwal and Mr. Sugam Mishra, Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for State with SI Anuj Chhikara, PS Crime Branch and SI Ravinder, DIU/Outer Mr. Tanvir Ahmed Mir, Senior Advocate with Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate for complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

%

22.05.2026

1. Applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 0097/2023 dated 17.04.2023 registered at Police Station Crime Branch for commission of offences under Sections 406/409/420/467/468/471/384/447/120-B IPC.
2. Aforesaid case was registered on the basis of complaint of Mr. Rajneesh Handa and according to the crux of allegations, applicant herein along with his some associates duped and cheated complainant by forging and fabricating several documents to illegally take over his family owned company and grab his property situated at Shimla. According to complainant, applicant got a false and fabricated case registered against the complainant with Police Station, *Economic Offences Wing* (EOW) and on the pretext of

BAIL APPLN. 814/2025

1



resolving the aforesaid litigation, cheated and induced him to sign various *Memorandum of Understandings* (MoUs) and blank documents for grabbing his aforesaid property.

3. As per Nominal Roll on record, applicant is in incarceration for more than three years and his overall jail conduct is found to be satisfactory.

4. On the last date when the present matter was taken up, Mr. Tanvir Ahmed Mir, learned Senior Counsel for complainant did admit that any litigant is having the fundamental right to have speedy trial but he, at the same time, he apprised that applicant is involved in many other cases of similar nature and if released, he may indulge in similar activities again.

5. The status of pending cases has been placed before the Court and undoubtedly, the *modus operandi* of the applicant is reflective of his *mala fide* intent as he seems to have duped other gullible and innocent persons in the same manner.

6. During course of the arguments, learned counsel for applicant submitted that in all the cases, which are pending in the State of Nagaland, the applicant is already on bail and no charge-sheet has yet been filed. He also submits that charges have been framed very recently in the present matter and since prosecution relies upon statements of 22 witnesses, there is no likelihood of trial getting concluded in near future. He submits that in such peculiar backdrop, it will be travesty of justice, if bail is denied.

7. During course of the arguments, it was stated by Mr. Shiv Upadhyay, learned counsel for applicant that applicant would be ready to abide by any condition to be imposed upon him in this regard and he would not come in contact of the complainant in any manner whatsoever, particularly, when he is stated to be settled abroad.



8. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case, period of incarceration and protracted nature of trial, *albeit*, without expressing any opinion over the merits of the case, applicant is admitted to bail on his furnishing personal bond in a sum of Rs. 25,000/- with two local sureties of the like amount and with following conditions:-

- (i) The applicant shall not leave India, without prior permission of learned Trial Court. Passport, if any shall be surrendered before the learned Trial Court.
- (ii) The applicant shall regularly appear before the learned Trial Court on all fixed dates.
- (iii) The applicant shall not try to contact and influence complainant or his associates or any witness and counsel, directly or indirectly.
- (iv) Applicant shall provide Mobile Number to the concerned SHO/IO and shall ensure that such Mobile Number remains active and operational, till the trial is over.

9. Needless to say, in case, he commits any other offence after his release from the jail in the present matter, it will entail cancellation of bail and not only the prosecution, even the complainant would be at liberty to move appropriate application seeking cancellation of bail.

10. Application stands disposed of accordingly.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 22, 2026/dr/sk