



\$~155

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3066/2025**

ANIL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Balwant Singh Billowria &
Mr. Akash Yadav, Advocates.**

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: **Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for State
with SI Anil & SI Ashok, P.S.
Sarojini Nagar.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

22.01.2026

%

1. By way of the present bail application, the applicant seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 210/2023, registered at Police Station Sarojini Nagar, District South West, New Delhi, for the offences punishable under Sections 420/467/468/471/120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"].

2. I have heard Mr. Balwant Singh Billowria, learned counsel for the applicant, and Ms. Priyanka Dalal, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The facts of the case, as per the status report filed by the State, are as follows:

a. The FIR was registered at the instance of the Sub Registrar VII-A, Palika Bhawan, R.K. Puram, Sarojini Nagar, New Delhi – 110023. The complainant stated that a Conveyance Deed,



purportedly executed by the Lease Administrative Officer of the Delhi Development Authority [“DDA”] in favour of one Sanjay Mathur, in respect of Plot No. 186B, Block No. B-4, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi, was presented before the Sub-Registrar’s office on 27.01.2023, but upon verification, the same was found to be forged.

b. The aforesaid beneficiary, Sanjay Mathur, was interrogated, and he disclosed that he had come in touch with two persons, namely Amit @Anil, i.e., the applicant herein, and Deepak, through local property dealers, namely Sanjay Kanojiya and Lokesh Gupta. They represented that one Pradeep Kumar was an officer of the DDA, and struck a deal for transfer of the said plot to Sanjay Mathur for a consideration of Rs. 1,60,00,000/-. Applicant and Deepak asked for Rs. 25,00,000/- as advance, after which, Sanjay Mathur arranged a total sum of Rs. 70,00,000/- in cash, and Rs.15,00,000 was also transferred to the account of the applicant and his wife. According to the aforesaid disclosure, Pradeep Kumar produced the Conveyance Deed, had it signed by Sanjay Mathur and two witnesses, and took a sum of Rs. 70,00,000/- from him.

c. The applicant was arrested on 17.10.2024 and co-accused, Deepak and one Madan Mohan Sharma @Pappu, were also arrested.

4. The petitioner’s application for regular bail was rejected on 26.05.2025 by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

5. Mr. Billowria submits that the applicant has already been in



custody with relation to the subject FIR for over one year. The chargesheet has been filed on 08.01.2025, but no charges have yet been framed. He submits that the co-accused Madan Mohan Sharma @Pappu, has been granted regular bail by order of this Court dated 23.07.2025 in BAIL. APPLN. 1104/2025, and that co-accused Pradeep Kumar was granted anticipatory bail, by an order dated 21.01.2026 in BAIL APPLN. 4462/2024. Co-accused Deepak has also been granted interim bail by this Court, which has been extended by order dated 24.07.2025.

6. Ms. Dalal, on the other hand, submits that the present case is distinguishable from the case of co-accused Madan Mohan Sharma@Pappu and Pradeep Kumar, as the applicant is one of the persons, who induced Sanjay Mathur in making the transactions and the sum of Rs. 15,00,000/- was also remitted by Sanjay Mathur into the bank account of the present applicant and his wife.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that it is appropriate to release the applicant on regular bail, having regard to the fact that the investigation is complete and the chargesheet has already been filed against him. The only distinction between the case of the present applicant and that of the co-accused, as argued by Ms. Dalal, concerns the receipt of money into the bank accounts of the applicant and his wife. Even if these allegations are ultimately established, the required evidence has already been placed before the Trial Court, and there is no likelihood of tampering with the evidence.

8. I am also conscious of the fact that the trial is likely to take a significant amount of time, as the matter is still at the stage of framing of charges and 16 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution in the charge



sheet.

9. The nominal roll called for from the jail authorities is handed over to the Court today and is taken on record. It shows that the applicant has already undergone judicial custody for over 1 year and 3 months, and his jail conduct has been certified as satisfactory. Ms. Dalal has also verified from the Investigating Officer [“IO”] that the applicant has no criminal antecedents.

10. Having regard to the aforesaid factors, the application is allowed and the applicant is admitted to regular bail in connection with FIR No. 210/2023, registered at Police Station Sarojini Nagar, District South West, New Delhi, for the offences punishable under Sections 420/467/468/471/120-B of IPC, subject to furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/-, with one surety of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the concerned Sessions Court/Duty M.M, and further subject to the following conditions:

- a) The applicant shall not leave the National Capital Territory of Delhi without prior permission of the Sessions Court.
- b) The applicant shall furnish his permanent address to the learned Sessions Court, as well as the address at which he is residing during the pendency of the case. The applicant shall also intimate the Investigating Officer and file an affidavit before the learned Sessions Court in the event of any change in his residential address.
- c) The applicant shall appear before the learned Sessions Court as and when the matter is taken up for hearing.
- d) The applicant shall provide his mobile number to the concerned



IO/Station House Officer, which shall be kept in a working condition at all times. The said mobile number shall not be switched off or changed without prior intimation to the IO during the pendency of the trial.

- e) The applicant shall not commit any offence during the period of his release.
- f) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make an inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever.

11. The bail application is disposed of in the above terms.

12. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application, and shall neither influence the trial proceedings, nor be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 22, 2026

'pv/JM'