$~9

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

% *Date of decision: 29th October,2026*

\# **CNR No. DLHC010424782026**

\+ BAIL APPLN. 3753/2026, CRL.M.A. 27843/2026 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1718/2026

NEERAJ SINGH @ NEERAJ KUMAR .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Chadha, Senior Advocate with Mr. Murari Kumar, Mr. Madhav, Mr. Harjas Singh, Mr. Dhruv Tomar and Mr. Suraj Singh, Advocates

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the State.
SI Satish Singh, P.S. Ashok Nagar
Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Mr. Vijender and Mr. Jarnail Singh, Advocates for complainant

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

AMIT BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present application has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ("BNSS"), seeking regular bail in FIR No. 577/2025 dated 11th December 2025 registered at P.S. New Ashok Nagar, East District, for offences under Sections 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

2. The applicant was arrested on 2nd August 2026. He was initially remanded to police custody for three (3) days and thereafter has remained in judicial custody.

3. Earlier, the applicant's first regular bail application under Section 480 BNSS was dismissed by the Magistrate on 6th August 2026. His subsequent application under Section 483 BNSS was dismissed by the Sessions Court on 25th August 2026.

4. As per the prosecution case, the applicant/accused Neeraj Singh @ Neeraj Kumar and co-accused Saurabh Srivastava had induced the complainant to invest money in Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. on the representation that the company had obtained a subcontract for work relating to laying of cables under a BSNL/NOFN project. It was alleged that pursuant to such representations, the complainant invested approximately Rs.72.27 lakh in the said venture and was also induced to purchase a tractor/trencher in connection with the project. The complainant's wife, namely Archana Koushik, was appointed as a Director of Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. and remained a Director from 24th September 2018 to 22nd October 2022. The applicant and co-accused, Saurabh Srivastava, are stated to have acted as authorised signatories and were involved in the affairs of the company. On the basis of the aforesaid complaint and the allegations of dishonest inducement and misappropriation of the amounts invested by the complainant, the present FIR was registered.

5. Notice in the application was issued *vide* order dated 9th September 2026.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

6. Status report has been filed on behalf of the State. As per the status report, Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. had entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Naubahar Singh, being the authorised contractor for execution of the work under the project. The applicant was actively involved in the affairs of Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. and played a central role in the transactions forming the subject matter of the present FIR. It is stated that the applicant failed to join the investigation despite repeated notices issued under Section 35(3) BNSS. Further, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required for tracing the flow of funds, verification of the relevant bank accounts, ledgers and financial records, and for identifying the ultimate beneficiaries of the alleged transactions.

7. Counsel for the applicant submits as follows:

7.1. The dispute arises out of a commercial transaction and the prosecution has failed to demonstrate any fraudulent inducement on the part of the applicant. There was no intention of the applicant to cheat the complainant as the project could not be completed due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

7.2. The alleged transactions relate to 2018–2021 and the subject FIR came to be registered after an inordinate delay of more than five (5) years.

7.3. The FIR has been registered without any jurisdiction as the entire set of events relating to the FIR occurred in the state of Uttar Pradesh. Therefore, there is no cause of action, except the fact that the complainant resides in Delhi.

7.4. The transactions relied upon by the prosecution are primarily documentary in nature and the relevant bank records, MCA records, audit

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

documents, work orders and correspondence are already available to the investigating agency. No specific recovery remains to be effected from the applicant and continued custodial interrogation is therefore not warranted.

7.5. Co-accused, Saurabh Srivastava, has been granted interim protection from arrest by this Court *vide* order dated 5th August 2026 in BAIL APPLN. 2697/2026. No concrete distinguishing feature between the roles of the applicant and the co-accused has been identified. Therefore, the applicant accordingly seeks parity with the co-accused.

7.6. The amount directly attributable to the applicant is approximately Rs.7.39 lakh as against the total amount of approximately Rs.72.27 lakh alleged to have been invested by the complainant. The same has been noted by the Sessions Court. Therefore, the applicant's culpability, if any, cannot, for the purposes of bail, be treated as co-extensive with the entire alleged amount.

7.7. The money trail is through the company's accounts rather than any demonstrated direct receipt by the applicant. The applicant was merely an authorised signatory of Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. and had no ownership or beneficial interest in the company. The wife of the complainant was a Director in Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd.

8. APP for the State opposes the present bail application and submits as follows:

8.1 Even though the wife of the complainant was a Director in Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd., the financial affairs of the company were in the control of the applicant and the co-accused.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

8.2 The inducement took place in Delhi, therefore, the territorial jurisdiction to register the present FIR in Delhi cannot be disputed.

8.3 The Sessions Court, while dismissing the applicant's previous bail application, had specifically observed that the investigation was at an early stage and that the applicant's role appeared to be central to the operational and financial affairs of the company.

8.4 The applicant is not entitled to bail merely on the ground of parity with the co-accused, whose role may be different.

9. Counsel appears on behalf of the complainant and vehemently opposes the bail application. He submits that there are two (2) similar FIRs registered against the applicant. In one of the FIRs registered at Moradabad, the applicant has been declared as a proclaimed offender (hereinafter 'P.O.) and this fact has not been disclosed in the affidavit filed with the petition.

10. He submits that the entire control of Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. was with the applicant and the co-accused. It is further highlighted that the MoU between Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. and Naubahar Singh, on the basis of which the complainant was induced into parting money, was an unsigned document.

11. In rejoinder, it is submitted on behalf of the applicant that in FIR dated 11th April, 2015, registered as Case Crime No.89/2015, the applicant has been granted interim protection by the Allahabad High Court *vide* order dated 17th December, 2015. The applicant is not aware that he has been declared a P.O. in the said FIR and accordingly, correct disclosure has been made by the applicant in the affidavit filed along with the bail application.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

12. I have heard the counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

13. As per the status report, the monies were paid by the complainant to the accused persons from the year 2018 till January 2021. The status report also records that Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. received approximately Rs.53,00,000/- from Naubahar Singh towards the project and work worth Rs.32,69,892/- was completed by Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. The status report also mentions that work was undertaken at the project site by Reno Infocom Pvt. Ltd. however, the work could not be completed.

14. In these circumstances, at this *prima facie* stage, it cannot be conclusively stated that the intention of the applicant was to cheat the complainant. It is plausible that the work could not be completed on account of other factors, including the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. The culpability of the applicant can only be established in trial.

15. It is also to be borne in mind that the monies were paid by the complainant to the accused person between 2018 and January 2021. However, the present FIR was registered only on 11th December, 2025, after a delay of almost 5 years.

16. The co-accused Saurabh Srivastava has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court *vide* order dated 5th August, 2026 and nothing substantial has been shown to show that the role of the applicant in the present case is substantially different from that of the co-accused.

17. Insofar as the contention of the counsel for the complainant that the applicant has not disclosed the fact that he was declared P.O. in another FIR relating to similar offence, the applicant has handed over a copy of the order

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

passed by the Allahabad High Court on 17th December, 2015, granting him interim protection. On the face of it, it cannot be disputed that the applicant was not aware if he was subsequently declared a proclaimed offender in the said case. The affidavit duly discloses the two (2) other FIRs registered against the applicant.

18. Investigation has already been completed and the charge-sheet has been filed.

19. Considering the totality of facts and circumstances as narrated above and taking into account that the trial is likely to take some time, in my opinion, further incarceration of the applicant is not necessary. Therefore, this Court considers it fit to grant bail to the applicant.

20. For the foregoing reasons, the present application is allowed and the applicant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the Trial Court and further subject to the following conditions:

i. The applicant shall not leave the country without the prior permission of the Court.

ii. The applicant shall appear before the Trial Court as and when the matter is taken up for hearing.

iii. The applicant shall join investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer (I.O.) concerned.

iv. The applicant shall provide his latest/fresh mobile number(s) to the I.O. concerned, which shall be kept in working condition at all times

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59

and shall not switch them off or change the mobile number(s) without prior intimation to the I.O. concerned.

v. The applicant shall provide his permanent address to the Trial Court. The applicant shall intimate the Court by way of an affidavit and to the I.O. regarding any change in his residential address.

vi. The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not communicate with or come in contact with any of the prosecution witnesses or tamper with the evidence of the case.

21. Needless to state that any observations made herein are purely for the purposes of deciding the question of grant of bail and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

22. Pending applications stand disposed of.

AMIT BANSAL, J

OCTOBER 29, 2026
Vivek/-

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:VIVEK MISHRA
Signing Date:30.10.2026 17:45:59