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

% ***Reserved on: 24th November, 2025***
Pronounced on: 18th February, 2026

\+ **CRL.MC. 7330/2025**

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) .....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the State with SI Sanjeet Singh

versus

ANKIT JHAMB
S/o Sh. Surinder Jhamb
R/o T-5, 2-A, Sant Nagar,
Rani Bagh, Saraswati Vihar,
Delhi-110034. .....Respondent
Through: Mr. Deepak Kohli, Advocate

\+ **CRL.MC. 4163/2025**

AVIATION SERVICES LLC
Regd. Office at TVARDOVSKOGO UL,
12-2IV/13, 123458, MOSCOW, RF 123458
Through its Authorized Representative
Mr. Himanshu Shekhar
R/o N-212, 2nd Floor,
Greater Kailash-1,
New Delhi -110048
Email: himanshu108@gmail.com .....Petitioner
Through: Mr. B.K Singh, Mr. Narendra Kumar and Ms. Shattika Haldar, Advocates

versus

1. **STATE (NCT OF DELHI)**
Through Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Economic Offences Wing,
Mandir Marg,
New Delhi-110001
Email: dcp.eow@delhipolice.gov.in

2. **MR. ANKIT JHAMB**
S/o Surinder Jhamb
R/o T-5 2-A, Sant Nagar,
Rani Bagh, Saraswati Vihar,
North West, Delhi-110034.
Email: ankit.jhamb8@gmail.com .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the State with SI Sanjeet Singh Mr. Deepak Kohli, Advocate for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

J U D G M E N T

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

1. Both the Petitions are being decided together as they involve similar facts and question of law.

CRL. M.C. 7330/2025

2. Petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 *(hereinafter referred to as "BNSS")* / Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 *(hereinafter referred to as "Cr.P.C.")* read with Section 483(3) BNSS/Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. have been filed on behalf of the **Petitioner/State (NCT of Delhi)** seeking **cancellation of Anticipatory Bail of Respondent, Ankit Jhamb** granted *vide* Order dated 22.04.2025 passed by Ld. ASJ-05, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi in FIR No. 41/2024 under Sections 420/406/468/471/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 *(hereinafter referred to as "IPC")*, at P.S. EOW.

3. The **brief facts of the case** are that the present FIR was registered on the **Complaint of Mr. Himanshu Shekhar**, **Authorized Representative of**

M/s Aviation Service LLC (a Russian Company). It was alleged that in **2022**, *Ms. Olga Basha*, senior official VTB Bank introduced one *Mr. Rohit Jain* to the Complainant. On 28.11.2022, *Mr. Igor Malyshknov*, Senior representative of the Complainant Company had a meeting with Rohit Jain regarding providing services to various foreign Companies to do business with India. Upon discussion, Mr. sRohit Jain advised to facilitate the supply of car spare parts and aviation goods through M/s Mangalam Traders, a proprietorship of Ankit Srivastav. A **Delivery Agreement dated 30.01.2023** was executed.

4. The Complainant further stated that Mr. Rohit Jain shared the Proforma Invoice of purported supplier's *M/s Impex International FZE* and *Aerojet Baltic*, *UAB*, as stated to be obtained by Mangalam Traders for rates of the goods as required by the Complainant Company. On the basis of proforma Invoices forwarded by Rohit Jain, believing it to be genuine, the **Complainant paid Rs.6,05,99,675.58/.** However, no goods were delivered.

5. Consequently, FIR No. 41/2024 under Sections 420/406/468/471/120B IPC at P.S. EOW, was registered.

6. Investigation revealed that although the Complainant's account was not maintained with JSC VTB Bank, intermediary transactions totalling to Rs. 6,05,99,625.28 were routed through VTB Bank (PJSC), Russia, between 20.02.2023 and 17.03.2023, as under:

Date	**Amount**
20.02.2023	3366633.28
06.03.2023	1821493.00
06.03.2023	41174640.00
15.03.2023	11015600.30
17.03.2023	3221309.50
Total	**6,05,99,625.28**

7. **Notices under Section 91 Cr.P.C** were issued to concerned persons and Banks, namely, Ms. Olga Basha (the then head of JSC VTB Bank), Branch Manager ICICI Bank. The analysis of the account of M/s Mangalam Traders (ICICI Bank, A/c No. 036705501542) revealed that the Current Bank A/c has been opened as proprietorship Firm M/s Mangalam Traders, Proprietor, Ankit Srivastav on 24.11.2021 and closed on 13.10.2023. As per the scrutiny of the statements of the aforesaid bank Account, the information regarding further transfer of funds into the accounts of beneficiaries, have been identified.

8. The analysis further revelated that the cheated amount exceeding Rs. 6 crore, was credited into this Account and subsequently transferred to five entities, including **M/s AJ Steel (Account Holder: Ankit Jhamb)**, M/s RJ Enterprises (Account Holder: Rajbir Singh), M/s BRISK Traders (Account Holder: Himanshu), M/s AV Global Trading (Account Holder: Vishal Oberoi), and M/s Invergise Global Pvt. Ltd (Account Holder: Deepak Kumar, Vinod Maherkar).

9. The analysis of beneficiary Accounts revealed further diversion of funds. The bank Accounts were debit frozen and further beneficiary details are under verification.

10. **Notice under Section 41A Cr.P.C was issued to Mr. Rohit Jain** to join the investigation, to which he responded that he was introduced to Mr. Igor Malyshkov by Ms. Olga Basha and as a lawyer, he could benefit by their contractual Agreements and rending legal opinion.

11. Mobile number 7303340418, linked to Mangalam Traders' account since inception, was registered in the name of one Jatin (since deceased).

CDR analysis showed it was used only for receiving bank SMS alerts and was primarily operational near the residence of Respondent, Ankit Jhamb.

12. **Notice under Section 41A Cr.P.C was issued to** Ankit Srivastav and stated that the Account of M/s Mangalam Traders was opened at the instance of Respondent, Ankit Jhamb and his brother Ankur Jhamb, and that they operated the account. He acknowledged signing cheques and being aware of the linked mobile number.

13. Further investigation revealed that *M/s AJ Steel (Respondent's firm)* received Rs. 53.34 lakhs from 20.02.2023 to 06.03.2023 from M/s Managlam Traders. M/s AJ Steel received Rs. 2,20,92,562/- from M/s RJ Enterprises from 06.03.2023 and 14.03.2023.

14. A sum of Rs. 50 lakh was transferred to M/s AV Global on 13.03.2023.

15. M/s RJ Enterprises received Rs. 2,38,69,992/- from M/s Mangalam Traders from 06.03.2023 and 18.03.2023.

16. It is submitted that besides, the Respondent receiving Rs. 3.15 crore of misappropriated amount in the account of M/s AJ steel, he was also operating the account of M/s RJ Enterprises, the other illegal beneficiary.

17. It is submitted that the Ld. ASJ granted interim protection to Respondent, Ankit Jhamb with direction to join investigation. He stated that on the instructions of one *Sumit Walia*, he had received the payment of Rs. 53.34 lakhs, between 20.02.2023 and 06.03.2023, from the Account of M/s Mangalam Traders in the Account of his firm M/s AJ Steel and further transferred Rs. 50 lakhs (on 13.03.2023) to M/s AV Global Company.

18. It is further stated that Ankit Jhamb of M/s AJ Steel has also received Rs. 2.21 crores approx. during the period between 06.03.2023 and

14.03.2023, from the account of M/s RJ Enterprises. Pertinently, the amount of Rs. 2.38 crores approx. between 06.03.2023 and 18.03.2023, was received in the bank Account of M/s RJ Enterprises from the Account of M/s Mangalam Traders.

19. An amount of Rs. 1,04,92,000/- (during the period between 20.02.2023 and 15.03.2023) has been transferred to Sumit Walia, from the Account of M/s AJ Steel.

20. The Respondent, however, failed to produce any Invoices or documents justifying these transactions.

21. Sumit Walia denied issuing any instructions to Respondent, Ankit Jhamb and denied knowledge of M/s Mangalam Traders or M/s RJ Enterprises, stating that payments received were loan repayments.

22. CDR and IMEI analysis established that on 27.06.2023, the SIM linked to M/s Mangalam Traders' Account, was inserted into a handset connected to Respondent's email ID. The Tower location of both the said number and Respondent's personal number, placed them in Mussoorie simultaneously, indicating active linkage.

23. Despite repeated notices under Section 41A Cr.P.C, Respondent initially did not cooperate and sought *Anticipatory Bail*, on grounds of parity. The I.O. opposed the Bail, stating that respondent operated the accounts used to divert Rs. 6,05,99,675.58/- and custodial interrogation was required for recovery of cheated funds.

24. However, *vide* Order dated 22.04.2025, ***the Ld. ASJ granted Anticipatory Bail to Respondent, Ankit Jhamb.***

25. It is submitted that under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C., **this Court is empowered to cancel Bail** where the Order granting Bail, suffers from legal infirmity or where custodial interrogation is necessary. As held in State (Delhi Administration) vs. Sanjay Gandhi, (1978) 2 SCC 411, *"Rejection of bail when bail is applied for, is one thing; cancellation of bail already granted is quite another".*

26. Reliance is also placed on *Dolat Ram vs. State of Haryana,* (1995) 1 SCC 349 wherein the Apex Court held that *"where a bail order is passed in disregard of material facts or in arbitrary manner, it can be set aside".* Similarly, reliance is placed on *Prahlad Singh Bhati vs. NCT of Delhi*, (2001) 4 SCC 280.

27. Reliance is also placed on *Dr. Narendra K. Amin vs. State of Gujarat and Anr.*, 2008 (6) SCALE 415, the Apex Court held that consideration of irrelevant materials, renders the bail Order vulnerable and liable to be set aside.

28. Reliance is also placed on *Prasanta Kumar Sarkar vs. Ashis Chatterjee*, (2010) 14 SCC 496; *Prakash Kadam and others vs. Ramprasad Viswanath Gupta and Another,* (2011) 6 SCC 189; *Neeru Yadav vs. State of UP,* (2014) 16 SCC 508; *Anil Kumar Yadav vs. State (NCT of Delhi),* (2018) 12 SC 129; *State of Kerala vs. Mahesh,* AIR 2021 SC 2071; *Abdul Basit vs. Abdul Kadir Choudhary,* (2014) 10 SCC 754; *Mahipal v. Rajesh Kumar,* (2020) 2 SCC 118; *Deepak Yadav vs. State of U.P. and Anr.,* Criminal Appeal No. 861 of 2022.

29. Reliance is placed on *Pinki vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.,* 2025 INSC 482 wherein the bail granted to the accused therein was cancelled, after a detailed consideration of the facts and the gravity of the offence, namely, child trafficking as well as the legal principles. The Apex Court underscored that while personal liberty is a cherished constitutional value, it is not absolute. Liberty must yield where it poses a threat to the collective interest of society. No individual can claim a liberty that endangers the life or liberty of others, as the rational collective cannot tolerate anti-social or anti-collective conduct.

30. Thus, it is submitted that the impugned Order dated 22.04.2025 passed by Ld. ASJ, Patiala House Courts is *ex facie* unsustainable as it is contrary to the material on record and suffers from serious non-application of mind to the facts and law involved.

31. *Hence, a prayer is made that the Order dated 22.04.2025 be set aside and the Anticipatory Bail granted to the Respondent be cancelled.*

32. A **Reply has been filed on behalf of the Respondent, Ankit Jhamb** wherein it is submitted that at the outset, all averments and contentions raised in the present Petition are denied.

33. It is submitted that M/s AJ Steels is not a beneficiary of any alleged cheated amount. No cheated amount was credited to the Firm. There were business/loan transactions between M/s Mangalam Traders and M/s AJ Steels much before the alleged transactions.

34. It is specifically denied that the said mobile phone was mostly operational in the locality of the residence of respondent Ankit Jhamb, Proprietor of M/s AJ Steels.

35. It is also submitted that Ankit Srivastav was not an employee of the Respondent or his brother. He is the proprietor of M/s Mangalam Traders and opened its bank Account himself. There is no evidence showing he worked for the Respondent.

36. It is admitted that Ankit Srivastav opened the bank Account of M/s Mangalam Traders and his photograph appears on the Account Opening

Form. Ankit Srivastav is the authorized signatory of the account of M/s Mangalam Traders.

37. It is further submitted that M/s AJ Steels received Rs. 2,20,92,562/- from M/s RJ Enterprises, during the stated period. *The transactions were part of regular business dealings since 2021.* Proper tax Invoices of business transactions between the two Firms, were submitted during investigation.

38. The Respondent has joined investigation whenever called and replied to Notice under Section 91 Cr.P.C., with documents. *There is no material showing that Respondent operated the accounts of M/s Mangalam Traders or M/s RJ Enterprises.*

39. The Respondent has justified all transactions. There were prior business/loan dealings with M/s Mangalam Traders, M/s RJ Enterprises and Sumit Walia. It is submitted that there was no loan outstanding, which was to be paid by Respondent to Sumit Walia. These were just the regular transactions between the Respondent and Sumit Walia, even before the alleged cheated amount was credited to M/s Mangalam Traders.

40. Furthermore, it is submitted that there is no documentary evidence regarding alleged tower location in Mussoorie. The Respondent's phone was lost and Complaint dated 28.11.2024 was lodged. SIM was used in another handset, thereafter. The Respondent has cooperated in investigation, justified transactions, and no custodial interrogation is required.

41. It is submitted that the judgments relied upon by the Petitioner, are not applicable. It is settled law that Bail once granted, should not be cancelled mechanically. Reliance is placed on *Deepak Yadav vs. State of U.P.*, *Dolat Ram vs. State of Haryana*, *Kailash Kumar vs. State of H.P.*, and *Ankit Mishra vs. State of M.P.*, wherein it stated that cancellation requires cogent and overwhelming circumstances such as misuse of liberty, tampering of evidence, absconding, or interference with trial. No such circumstance exists in the present case.

42. Furthermore, the Order dated 22.04.2025 passed by Ld. ASJ is a detailed, reasoned order passed after considering the Status Report and material on record. There is no ground for cancellation of bail.

43. *Hence, the Petition is liable to be dismissed.*

CRL. M.C. 4163/2025:

44. Petition under Section 528 BNSS/Section 483(3) Cr.P.C. filed on behalf of the **Complainant/Petitioner/Aviation Services, LLC** against **Order dated 28.05.2025** passed by Ld. ASJ-05, New Delhi District, Patiala House Courts whereby the **Application for cancellation of Bail of Respondent, Ankit Jhamb granted *vide* Order 22.04.2025, was dismissed.**

45. The Petitioner was cheated of Rs. 6,05,99,675.58/-, transferred to Account No. 036705501542 of M/s Mangalam Traders (Prop. Ankit Srivastav) for export of goods. The amount was allegedly diverted to illegal beneficiaries including M/s AJ Steel (Prop. Ankit Jhamb), M/s RJ Enterprises and others. FIR No. 41/2024 was accordingly registered.

46. The *Complainant submits that accused Rohit Jain, Ankit Srivastav, and other named accused deliberately committed cognizable offences and misappropriated Rs.6,05,99,675.58/-.* Despite Notices, they have avoided investigation and failed to account for the siphoned amount. Acting in conspiracy, they continue to benefit from the misappropriated funds, as reflected in the ATRs dated 01.10.2024 and 28.01.2025 filed before the Ld. CMM, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

47. The Apex Court in *Puran vs. Rambilas*, (2001) 6 SCC 338 held that Bail can be cancelled where material evidence is ignored and a perverse Order granting bail, is passed in serious offences.

48. It is submitted that more than two years have elapsed; no recovery of cheated amount has been made and investigation remains incomplete. The Ld. Sessions Court failed to consider that Respondent No.2 is influential and capable of influencing witnesses and tampering with the evidence.

49. *Lastly,* it is submitted that the Respondent, Ankit Jhamb filed Anticipatory Bail claiming parity with co-accused, Sumit Walia. The impugned Order suffers from non-consideration of material facts and warrants interference under Section 483(3) read with Section 528 BNSS.

50. This, the present petition is *bona fide* and filed in the interest of justice.

51. The **Investigating Officer filed detailed Replies dated 07.04.2025, 15.04.2025 and 19.04.2025 stating *inter alia*:**

a. Respondent did not join investigation despite Notices.
b. Rs. 3.15 Crores of misappropriated money was received in M/s AJ Steel.
c. He and his brother operated accounts of M/s Mangalam Traders and M/s RJ Enterprises, wherefrom the whole amount of Rs. 6,05,99,675.58 was diverted / misappropriated.
d. Mobile number linked to Mangalam Traders account was active in his locality.
e. IP logs of transactions were traced to his address.

52. It is submitted that despite these materials, Ld. ASJ granted Anticipatory Bail on 22.04.2025 observing parity and treating him as second layer beneficiary.

53. The Petitioner filed an Application for cancellation of Bail, before the Sessions Court pursuant to the liberty granted by this Court *vide* order dated 05.05.2025. However, *vide* **impugned Order dated 28.05.2025, the Ld. ASJ dismissed the cancellation Application without properly appreciating investigation reports and incriminating materials.**

54. A **Reply has been filed by the Respondent, Ankit Jhamb** wherein in addition to the averments already made, it is stated that there is nothing on record to show that Respondent No. 2 opened or operated the Accounts of Mangalam Traders or RJ Enterprises. Bail was granted after due consideration, and Respondent No. 2 has complied with all conditions.

55. It is specifically denied that Ankit Srivastav received threats from Respondent No. 2. The allegations are claimed to be false and baseless. Respondent No. 2 has complied with all Bail conditions.

56. *Hence, the present Petition is liable to be dismissed.*

Submissions heard and record perused.

57. Before considering the contentions on merit, it is significant to observe that there is a distinction between recall and cancellation of Bail. While recall can be made only if it is established that Bail has been granted by not considering the relevant facts on merits, cancellation is prompted by subsequent events and violation of terms of Bail by the Respondent.

58. The Apex Court in *Y vs. State of Rajasthan,* (2022) 9 SCC 269 underscored that an order granting bail can be tested on ***illegality***, ***perversity***, ***arbitrariness*** *and being* ***based on unjustified material***. While setting aside the order granting bail, the Court made the following observations highlighting the ***distinction between recall and cancellation of bail****:*

> "15. *It is worth noting that what is being considered in this case relates to whether the High Court has exercised the discretionary power under Section 439 CrPC in granting bail appropriately. Such an assessment is different from deciding whether circumstances subsequent to the grant of bail have made it necessary to cancel the same.* ***The first situation requires the Court to analyse whether the order granting bail was illegal, perverse, unjustified or arbitrary. On the other hand, an application for cancellation of bail looks at whether supervening circumstances have occurred warranting cancellation.****"*

59. Three-Judge Bench of Apex Court in *P vs. State of M.P.,* (2022) 15 SCC 211 has explained the considerations that must weigh with the Court for interfering in an Order granting bail to an accused under Section 439(1) CrPC as under:

> *"24. .....****To put it differently, in ordinary circumstances, this Court would be loathe to interfere with an order passed by the court below granting bail but if such an order is found to be illegal or perverse or premised on material that is irrelevant, then such an order is susceptible to scrutiny and interference by the appellate court."***

60. In the recent case of *Ajwar vs.Waseem*, (2024) 10 SCC 768, it was observed as under:

> *"27. It is equally well settled that bail once granted, ought not to be cancelled in a mechanical manner. However, an unreasoned or perverse order of bail is always open to interference by the superior court. If there are serious allegations against the accused, even if he has not misused the bail granted to him, such an order can be cancelled by*

the same Court that has granted the bail. Bail can also be revoked by a superior court if it transpires that the courts below have ignored the relevant material available on record or not looked into the gravity of the offence or the impact on the society resulting in such an order."

61. It has been further observed in Ajwar, (supra):

> *"28. The considerations that weigh with the appellate court for setting aside the bail order on an application being moved by the aggrieved party* ***include any supervening circumstances that may have occurred after granting relief to the accused****, the conduct of the accused while on bail, any attempt on the part of the accused to procrastinate, resulting in delaying the trial, any instance of threats being extended to the witnesses while on bail, any attempt on the part of the accused to tamper with the evidence in any manner."*

62. In the recent judgement of Ashok Dhankad, (supra), the Apex Court has reiterated that while considering as to whether bail ought to be granted in a matter involving a serious criminal offence, the Court must consider relevant factors like *the nature of the accusations made against the accused, the manner in which the crime is alleged to have been committed, the gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the accused, the criminal antecedents of the accused, the probability of tampering of the witnesses and repeating the offence, if the accused are released on bail, the likelihood of the accused being unavailable in the event bail is granted, the possibility of obstructing the proceedings and evading the courts of justice and the overall desirability of releasing the accused on bail.*

63. It summarized the factors for consideration for setting aside of Bail Orders as under:

> *"19. The principles which emerge as a result of the above discussion are as follows:*
>
> ***(i)*** *An appeal against grant of bail cannot be considered to be on the same footing as an application for cancellation of bail;*
> ***(ii)*** *The Court concerned must not venture into a threadbare analysis of the evidence adduced by prosecution. The merits of such evidence must not be adjudicated at the stage of bail;*
> ***(iii)*** *An order granting bail must reflect application of mind and assessment of the relevant factors for grant of bail that have been elucidated by this Court.*
> ***(iv)*** *An appeal against grant of bail may be entertained by a superior Court on grounds such as perversity; illegality; inconsistency with law; relevant factors not been taken into consideration including gravity of the offence and impact of the crime;*
> ***(v)*** *However, the Court may not take the conduct of an accused subsequent to the grant bail into consideration while considering an appeal against the grant of such bail. Such grounds must be taken in an application for cancellation of bail; and*
> ***(vi)*** *An appeal against grant of bail must not be allowed to be used as a retaliatory measure. Such an appeal must be confined only to the grounds discussed above."*

64. In the light of aforesaid principles, the contentions raised in the present Petition be now considered. The present Petitions essentially do not disclose any supervening circumstance warranting cancellation.

65. ***Firstly***, the grounds urged are essentially a reiteration of the allegations forming the basis of the FIR and the magnitude of the alleged financial transactions. *Mere seriousness of the accusations or the quantum involved, in the absence of misconduct post the grant of Bail,* does not constitute a ground for cancellation within the parameters laid down in Dolat Ram, (supra).

66. ***Secondly***, in the Order dated 22.04.2025 granting Anticipatory Bail, the Ld. ASJ considered the Status Report of the Investigating Officer, the nature of the alleged financial trail, the documentary character of the evidence, and the fact that the offences invoked are punishable with imprisonment up to 7 years. Ld. ASJ also recorded that the Respondent had joined investigation and that custodial interrogation was not demonstrated to be indispensable, at that stage.

67. ***Thirdly***, the contention that the case involves an economic offence of considerable magnitude does not, by itself, alter the settled threshold for cancellation.

68. ***Fourthly,*** the subsequent Order dated 28.05.2025 of Ld. ASJ declining cancellation correctly noted as under:

> *"To my mind this is not a case wherein the concession of anticipatory bail granted requires to be set aside. It is also not that the accused has misused the liberty or violated the terms and conditions of the bail. He has a permanent residence and is not a flight risk. Conditions have already been imposed at the time of grant of bail. IO can investigate/continue to investigate the case in accordance with law."*

69. It was further observed that non-recovery of the alleged amount, by itself, cannot constitute a ground for cancellation, particularly when the case rests substantially on documentary material already in possession of the investigating agency. *Every aspect had already been investigated including the alleged money trail. The version of the accused Ankit Jhamb is* *diametrically opposite and at this juncture i.e. adjudication of the bail cannot be evaluated.*

70. The Petitions, even on re-appreciation of the merits of the case, do not reflect that the Bail has been granted without considering the relevant facts of the case or has been granted on extraneous grounds which is impermissible in proceedings for cancellation of Bail. *No factors such as perversity; illegality; inconsistency with law; relevant factors not been taken into consideration including gravity of the offence and impact of the crime, as stated in Ashok Dhankad,* (supra), *have been made out.*

71. ***In the end,*** it may be observed that there is no allegation that the Respondent, Ankit Jhamb has violated any condition of Bail, failed to join investigation, tampered with evidence, threatened witnesses, or attempted to abscond.

Conclusion:

72. There is no merit in the present Petitions, which are hereby, **dismissed**.

73. Pending Applications are also disposed of accordingly.

(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 18, 2026
N