



\$~10

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4427/2026 & CRL.M.A. 18287/2026

SANDEEP CHAWLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Kundu, Mr. Bhagat Singh, Mr. Shitanshu Saklani and Mr. Shubam Mavi, Advs.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

01.07.2026

%

1. Mr. Himanshu Kundu, learned counsel appearing for the applicant/complainant, points out from the order dated 11.07.2025 passed by this Court that the Court was given the impression as if there was no other criminal case of a similar nature pending against the accused-Ishu Sharma. He then submits that on an application being filed by the present applicant for cancellation of bail, the State had filed the status report. In the status report, it has come on record that there are multiple complaints across Pan India where involvement of the accused has surfaced as a first layer accused. He, thus, points out that the entire premise for grant of bail has been demolished and, therefore, the anticipatory bail granted to the accused-Ishu Sharma deserves to be cancelled.



2. The Court finds that in the application seeking cancellation of the bail, the present applicant sought liberty to withdraw the same with liberty to approach the trial court. The applicant, thereafter, moved an application for cancellation of bail before the trial court and the trial court, in its order dated 17.04.2026, has noted that the accused is involved in multiple complaints of a similar nature. The trial court, however, was of the opinion that since there was no assertion by the prosecution regarding non-cooperation etc. and in the absence of there being any application at the instance of the State, the application at the behest of the present applicant/complainant was rejected.

3. Though, this Court finds that the present applicant also has a right to seek cancellation of the bail already granted to the accused, however, the Court under the facts and circumstances of the present case, finds that the cancellation of bail is not required merely on finding the accused involved in other complaints. The other complaints, filed against the accused, will have to be investigated in accordance with law. On the basis of the complaints, whether any crime is also registered is one of the aspect requires consideration. As of now, the benefit of anticipatory bail does not require to be withdrawn bearing in mind the overall facts and circumstances.

4. If the prosecution finds that the accused is not cooperating in the present investigation, the prosecution shall be at liberty to file an application seeking cancellation of the bail of the accused. If such an application is filed, the same shall be considered by the trial court in accordance with law.

5. With these observations, the instant application seeking cancellation of bail stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 01, 2026/P