



\$~56

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% **Date of Decision: 11th May, 2026**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1840/2026**

PAPPU KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Abhay Kumar and Ms. Priyanka
Kumar, Advocates.**

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: **Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State
with SI Chandrashekhar.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

CRL.M.A. 14842/2026 (exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 1840/2026

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.80101884 dated 27.10.2025 registered at P.S Delhi Cantt for commission of offences under Section 303(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)*, 2023 (corresponding Section 379 of IPC).
2. According to applicant, he has been falsely implicated in the case in hand. He was driver with RAPIDO and the complainant had booked his vehicle i.e. Dzire as she was to come back from Nizamuddin Railway Station to a Guest House situated at Palam Air Force Station. According to him, the due fare was paid and the cab driver i.e. applicant was duly discharged and thereafter the complainant reported the matter to police, claiming that her one bag was missing.
3. As per investigating agency, the cab was taken but immediately after the complainant found her one bag to be missing, she sent message to the



applicant herein and despite above, the applicant absconded. He did not join the investigation despite given due notice in this regard by the police.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that for totally unwarranted reasons, father of the applicant was also arrested for the offence in question and that he has already been granted bail by the learned Trial Court. During course of the arguments, copy of such bail order was shown which gives an impression as if the bail had been granted to him on account of the recovery being effected already. However, when asked in this regard, learned Addl. P.P. for the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, submits that nothing, with respect to the stolen bag, was recovered and it was only the cab in question which had been seized.

5. She also reveals an important aspect of the case.

6. She submits that father of the applicant herein was the registered owner of the vehicle in question and it was one 'Naveen', who was registered with RAPIDO App and thus the applicant was driving the abovesaid cab, in an unauthorized manner.

7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that he was never instructed in this regard and is not aware that some third person 'Naveen' was registered with RAPIDO App.

8. Keeping in mind the conduct of the applicant, who absconded immediately after the incident and the abovesaid non-revelation of material fact, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the applicant.

9. The application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 11, 2026/st/sk