



\$~112

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1212/2026**

DIXIT ADITYA SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Mr. Rajesh
Kumar Bhatia, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State
with SI Praveen Kumar Yadav, P.S.
Chankyapuri

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **02.04.2026**

CRL.M.A. 9435/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1212/2026

3. By way of this application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 13/2026, registered at Police Station Chanakyapuri, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4)/336(3)/340(2)/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').
4. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that a complaint/information dated 05.02.2026 was received from the Office of Overseas Criminal Investigations, U.S. Embassy, New Delhi, regarding the



alleged commission of cognizable offences by one Anita along with Nishant Sharma and Aditya Bhardwaj. It is alleged that the co-accused Anita had applied for a non-immigrant visa in the U.S. Embassy, New Delhi, and in support of her application, had submitted documents including an offer letter and an employment certificate purportedly issued by Crossroads Hospital, Sonipat. During the course of the visa interview conducted on the same date, it is alleged that Anita had admitted that she had never been employed with Crossroads Hospital and that the documents submitted by her were forged. It was further alleged that co-accused Nishant Sharma, associated with IBT Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Karnal, had advised her to prepare such documents and facilitated the submission of false information in the visa application, while the applicant Aditya Bhardwaj, an employee of Crossroads Hospital, had allegedly prepared and provided the forged employment documents. Accordingly, the present FIR was registered.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role in the alleged preparation of forged employment documents for visa purposes. It is contended that the allegations are entirely unfounded, as the applicant neither had the authority nor the capacity to prepare documents on behalf of the said hospital, and there exists no corroborative material to substantiate his involvement in the alleged offence. The learned counsel further submits that the evidence in the present case is purely documentary in nature, all of which is already in possession of the investigating agency, and therefore, no custodial interrogation of the applicant is warranted. It is also submitted that the applicant has not received any monetary benefit from the co-accused Anita, who has falsely implicated him in her statement, and that the



applicant is not personally acquainted with her but only knows her husband. It is also argued that allegations are against one Aditya Bhardwaj whereas the applicant is Dixit Aditya Sharma. It is further contended that the applicant is ready to join the investigation as and when required by the I.O. and he would cooperate in the investigation. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that the investigation is at an initial stage, and the source of the forged documents is yet to be ascertained. It is stated that the custodial interrogation of the accused is required to recover the electronic devices used in the preparation of forged documents, as well as the letterhead, seal of the hospital and to obtain specimen handwriting and signatures for the purpose of investigation. The learned APP further argues that Section 338 of BNS has also been invoked in the present case, which reflects the seriousness of the allegations. It is also contended that despite notices issued under Section 35(3) of BNSS twice, the applicant has failed to join the investigation. It is therefore prayed that the present application seeking anticipatory bail be rejected.

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

8. During the course of arguments, this Court was informed by the learned APP, on instructions from the IO, that the co-accused Anita had disclosed the involvement of the present applicant. It was further submitted that, in her initial statement, she had inadvertently mentioned the name of the applicant incorrectly as Aditya Bhardwaj; however, she subsequently clarified that the correct name of the accused is Dixit Aditya Sharma

9. After considering the material available on record and the rival



submissions advanced, this Court finds that the present applicant has been attributed an active and specific role in the commission of the alleged offence. During investigation, a notice under Section 94 of BNSS was served upon the Crossroads Hospital, Sonipat, for verification of the offer letter and certificate of employment, and in reply, the I.O. was informed that the documents in question were forged. Therefore, the material collected during investigation, including the verification from Crossroads Hospital, Sonipat, *prima facie* establishes that the offer letter and employment certificate submitted for visa purposes were forged.

10. It is the specific case of prosecution that the applicant was directly involved in the preparation of such forged documents. This Court further notes that despite service of notices under Section 35(3) of BNSS on two occasions, i.e., on 25.02.2026 and 27.02.2026 through the applicant's father, the applicant has failed to join the investigation and appears to be deliberately evading the same.

11. Additionally, the investigation is still at a nascent stage, and custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary to unearth the larger conspiracy, ascertain the source and manner of preparation of the forged documents, and to effect the recovery of the electronic devices, including a laptop/computer, allegedly used in their preparation, as well as the letterhead and seal of the hospital. The requirement to obtain the applicant's specimen handwriting and signatures further necessitates his custodial interrogation.

12. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

13. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

14. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall



tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

APRIL 02, 2026/ns

GJ