



\$~61

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1508/2026 & CRL.M.A. 11975/2026**

ANAND PASWAN ALIAS PANGA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Advocate

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with Inspector Naveen Kumar and SI
Dharmendra Sharma

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

%

20.04.2026

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 108/2021 of Police Station Patel Nagar for offence under Section 307/323/34 IPC.
2. It is considered apposite, so order passed today itself in Bail Application No. 1507/2026 in which same counsel has appeared is extracted below:

“1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 644/2023 of Police Station Moti Nagar for offence under Section 307/34 IPC & Section 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act.

2. It appears that earlier, vide order dated 12.02.2026, the bail application bearing No. 1880/2025 of the accused/applicant was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh before the trial court subsequent to the testimony of the injured Raju, who had not been appearing before the trial court. The injured Raju appeared and supported prosecution case in his testimony. Thereafter, the accused/applicant filed fresh bail application before the Court of Sessions, which was dismissed vide order dated 30.03.2026. By way of detailed reasons, described in paragraph 6 of the order dated



30.03.2026, the learned trial court dismissed the bail application. After that, the present application has been filed.

3. At the outset, learned APP for State submits that the accused/applicant has also filed an interim bail application, which is pending before the trial court. In other words, the accused/applicant is proceeding before two courts simultaneously.

4. Further, it is found that the present bail application is not even accompanied with vakalatnama of the accused/applicant. That, apparently was to avoid any consequences of filing this application during pendency of the application before the trial court.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for accused/applicant seeks permission to withdraw this bail application.

6. As requested, the bail application and the accompanying application are dismissed as withdrawn.”

3. Present case is yet another case on similar lines when it comes to the vakalatnama. Since the present case came up immediately after the order passed in Bail Application No. 1507/2026, in order to rule out any mischief, I examined the affidavit supporting the bail application and the vakalatnama.

4. The bail application has been filed through *paurokar* Mr. Munna Lal. In the supporting affidavit, the relevant column No. 5 as regards previous bail applications simply mentions NA. But the Registry, in its wisdom cleared the application and placed it for hearing.

5. More shocking is that the vakalatnama filed with the bail application appears to have been forged. Title of the court and the case in the vakalatnama was found covered with white fluid and thereafter, title of this Court and the case were typewritten while rest of the vakalatnama is handwritten. Even name of the litigant signing the vakalatnama is Anand while the *paurokar* is Munna Lal. Registry seems to have ignored this also.



6. Further, on being called upon to show the original *vakalatnama*, learned counsel for accused/applicant produced a photocopy of the *vakalatnama*. It is the same *vakalatnama* but bears title of the court as Ms. Shefali Barnala Tandon, Tis Hazari Courts and title of the case as *State vs Anand Paswan*.

7. It appears that for filing this bail application, someone applied white fluid on the *vakalatnama* filed before the trial court and used the same for filing this bail application.

8. It is also observed that attestation endorsement of the trial court on the *vakalatnama* is undated.

9. On being confronted with the aforesaid, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that it is his associate counsel Mr. Sanjay Kumar, who is responsible for this tampering. It is submitted by learned counsel for accused/applicant that he had handed over the brief to Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate only for the purposes of filing this Bail Application.

10. It is indeed a matter of concern that the system of *pairokari* is often being misused. It is during the covid period that the Advocates were allowed to file the petitions/applications through *pairokars* so that they do not have to visit the jail and get the pleadings signed by the prisoners. When it comes to taking action in such cases, the *pairokar* goes unscathed and even the petitioner/applicant prisoner cannot be penalized as she/he might not even be aware about the proceedings. Now that there is no more pandemic situation, the High Court needs to consider as to whether such system of filings through *pairokars* be discontinued, directing that each filing be signed by the petitioner/applicant prisoner personally in jail, for which the counsel personally or through clerk would visit the jail.



11. Copy of this order be sent to the worthy Registrar General of this Court for placing it before the Hon'ble Chief Justice for necessary Practice Directions. Copy of this order along with a copy of the *vakalatnama* (*printed page No. 117 of paperbook*) be also sent to the learned trial court to ascertain the genuineness of the attestation of the *vakalatnama*, which attestation is undated.
12. At this stage, learned counsel for accused/applicant seeks permission to withdraw this bail application.
13. As requested, the bail application and the accompanying application are dismissed as withdrawn.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 20, 2026/as