$~8

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 1219/2026

HIMANSHU SHARMA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravindra Narayan and Mohammad Nazim, Advocates

versus

STATE OF N.C.T. OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State with SI Mahavir Jogi, Police Station Barakhamba Road, New Delhi
Mr. Shilpinder Singh Sobti, NMr. Ajay Kohli, Mr. Anshvendra Singh, Ms. Aishani Datta and Ms. Apoorva Agarwal, Advocates for complainant

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

O R D E R

% **08.05.2026**

CRL.M.A. 9472-73/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Applications stand disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1219/2026

3. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 96/2025, registered at Police Station Barakhamba Road, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4)/316(4)/336(3)/340(2)/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter '*BNS*').

4. Brief facts of the case are that a complaint was lodged by Dook Travels Pvt. Ltd., a travel management company having its office at Barakhamba Road, New Delhi, against the present applicant, Himanshu Sharma, who had joined the company on 23.02.2024. It was alleged that during the course of his employment, the applicant had indulged in systematic fraudulent activities including misappropriation of more than ₹50 lakhs belonging to the company and its clients by accepting payments outside the official channels and diverting the same to his personal bank accounts and UPI IDs. It was further alleged that the applicant had forged airline tickets and travel-related documents, fabricated itineraries, and issued false travel confirmations in the name of the complainant company in order to deceive clients. The complainant further alleged that the applicant had also cheated several individuals, including at least four women from different States, on the false promise of arranging travel to Russia, and had collected about ₹6.5 lakhs in his personal accounts. One such victim, namely, Sheelwant Kaur, was allegedly issued a fake air ticket by the applicant, following which he stopped responding to her calls and messages. The complaint also referred to internal audit findings, screenshots of WhatsApp conversations, forged travel documents, transaction records, and suspicious UPI IDs allegedly linked to the applicant, through which unauthorized transactions were stated to have been conducted. It was further alleged that the applicant had absconded from 29.07.2025 immediately after the financial irregularities came to light. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the applicant under the relevant provisions of law.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the

applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the complainant company itself had been routing client payments through the accounts of employees in order to evade GST liability, and has now falsely portrayed the same as acts of misappropriation by the applicant. It is argued that the applicant had merely acted under the directions of his manager, Durgesh Uniyal. It was further submitted that in the case of client Sheelwant Kaur, an amount of about ₹6,31,000/- had been received in the account of the applicant on behalf of the complainant company and thereafter transferred in smaller amounts to different employees through online transactions on the instructions of the manager. The learned counsel further argues that in one case concerning a Europe travel booking, the complainant company itself had cancelled the ticket after receiving about ₹2,70,000/- from the client, and thereafter falsely implicated the applicant. It is submitted that the booking had been made through the official email ID provided to the applicant and the ticket had been generated through Riya Travels. It is also contended that the dispute relating to client Sheelwant Kaur already stands settled, as the amount in question had been refunded and the said client had acknowledged receipt of the same and issued a "no dues" confirmation through WhatsApp communication.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP appearing for the State, assisted by the learned counsel appearing for the complainant, opposes the present bail application and argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature and involve large-scale financial fraud, cheating, forgery, and misappropriation of company as well as client funds. It was argued that the applicant had allegedly forged travel documents, airline tickets, official seals, and signatures of the company in order to cheat various clients in a

systematic and pre-planned manner. It was further submitted that though the applicant had joined the investigation pursuant to the interim protection granted by the Court, he had not cooperated fully with the investigating agency and had failed to furnish complete details and supporting documents regarding the financial transactions under scrutiny. The learned APP further argues that the proceeds of crime are yet to be fully recovered and the role of other persons allegedly involved in the transactions is still under investigation. It was also contended that the investigation is at a crucial stage and, in case the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, there exists a likelihood of his tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, particularly the clients and other persons known to him.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has perused the material available on record.

8. In the present case, this Court notes that during the course of investigation, the bank account statements of the applicant Himanshu Sharma, as well as those of his father, mother, uncle, and cousin, were obtained and analyzed. It is revealed that during the period from 23.02.2024 till 21.07.2025, an amount of about ₹34,50,000/- was credited into the account of the applicant, out of which ₹4,50,700/- was deposited in cash. It is further to be noted that substantial amounts were also credited into the accounts of his family members from various clients, including ₹8,59,250/- in the account of his father, ₹8,38,000/- in the account of his mother, ₹4,00,000/- in the account of his uncle, and ₹1,60,000/- in the account of his cousin.

9. This Court further notes that as per prosecution, during interrogation, the applicant claimed that he had acted under the directions of his manager,

Durgesh Uniyal, and that the amounts received from clients, as well as the tickets and credit notes issued to clients, had been handled at his instance. However, it is pertinent to note that no documentary material or supporting evidence was produced by the applicant in support of such assertions. It is also significant that despite alleging that he was merely acting under instructions, the applicant had admittedly received client payments in his personal account as well as in the accounts of his family members, and the said amounts were not deposited in the official account of the complainant company.

10. It is further to be noted that while the applicant claimed that only about ₹15,80,000/- had been received in the accounts of himself and his relatives, the analysis of the bank accounts allegedly reflected credits amounting to about ₹37,70,483/- from clients into the said accounts. The investigation has also revealed that certain amounts were allegedly received in cash from clients, including ₹5,10,000/- from Mrs. Rohit Kothari and ₹2,50,000/- from Rohit Jain, whereas only an amount of ₹2,16,300/- was ultimately transferred into the official account of the complainant company.

11. This Court also notes that while rejecting the bail application, the learned Sessions Court had observed that certain victims, i.e. Ankita Kothari and Rohit Kothari, had joined the proceedings and stated that the applicant used to personally visit their residence for collecting payments and had issued fake flight tickets and forged hotel vouchers to them. They had further alleged that upon reaching the airport, they were informed that the tickets were fake, and they were even apprehended by the authorities on suspicion of attempting to travel on forged documents. The learned Sessions Court had further noted the statement of another victim, i.e. Datta Prasad R.

Desai, who had alleged that fake credit notes were issued by the applicant and despite payment being made, no booking had been made in his name.

12. Thus, at this stage, the material collected during investigation prima facie indicates misappropriation of company and client funds by the applicant, and the possible involvement of other persons is also stated to be under investigation.

13. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, considering the nature of the allegations, the substantial amount allegedly involved, the material collected during investigation, and the fact that the investigation regarding the money trail and involvement of other persons is still continuing and will require custodial interrogation of the applicant, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

14. The bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

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

16. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 08, 2026/ns

TD