



Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401d48889627a77b265ffff4a
c45596433962c6fb4835d43597626cac
o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, CN: 704763,
postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=d3e8679e451ec45c07b5
5570996b40f80bd2ee6f6402c487965f
1e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2023.04.23.09:00:13.0700



2. Having examined the record, I am unable to accept the contentions of learned counsel for petitioner.
3. It is not that the learned Court of Sessions exercised any power under Section 156(3) CrPC and/or directed further investigation.
4. For a clear understanding, paragraph 23 of the impugned order, which according to learned counsel is the core of the dispute, is extracted below:

“23. In view of the fact that in the charge-sheet itself it has been mentioned that the investigation regarding the money trail is yet to be conducted, this court does not find any ground to grant bail to the applicant at this stage. Consequently the application at hand is dismissed. However, it is also observed here that the applicant cannot be kept in custody for perpetuity while the complainant and the police sleep over the further investigation required to be conducted in this case. Therefore, a copy of the order be sent to the DCP concerned with directions to monitor further investigation in this case and to trace the proceeds from the alleged sale of the properties to the complainant at the earliest.”

5. As is obvious from above extract, the Court of Sessions while dismissing the bail application observed that the present petitioner cannot be kept in custody for perpetuity and the police has to be diligent in completing further investigation for which it had explained in the chargesheet. As explained in the chargesheet, investigation as regards money trail was yet to be conducted and after that supplementary chargesheet had to be filed, the learned Court of Sessions simply directed the concerned DCP to monitor the further investigation and conclude the same at the earliest. The idea was to



2026:DHC:3562



ensure that the petitioner/accused is not kept in jail unnecessarily.

6. I am unable to find any infirmity in the impugned order, so the same is upheld and the petition and accompanying applications are dismissed.

7. Although the petition is completely frivolous, cost is not being imposed keeping in mind that the petitioner is in jail.

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4afe
c45569af3962c9fb4835d435f97626cacca,
ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, CN=7047638,
postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=c3a6079645fec45c07b5d1
5570996b40f80cbd2eee60402c487965f8
01e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2026.04.27 05:08:41 -07'00'

GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)

APRIL 27, 2026/ry