$~2

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

\+ BAIL APPLN. 3789/2025

PRASUN PANDEY .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amol Kokane, Advocate.

versus

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

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP for the State.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI**

**<u>O R D E R</u>**

**% 09.03.2026**

By way of the present petition filed under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.0141/2021 dated 08.09.2021 registered under sections 420/406/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Economic Offences Wing, Delhi.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he alongwith his father (Ravinder Kumar Pandey) and brother (Pranjal Pandey) was running a chit fund/'committee' scheme in his local area, under which they collected various sums of money from the residents of that area and other persons, against the promise to pay back the money with high rates of return. Monies are stated to have been paid by the complainants under this money circulation scheme by way of fixed amounts every month by way of investment.

3. The subject FIR was registered on a complaint made by 25 identified victims; and the amount stated to have been defalcated/cheated is about Rs.3.63 crores for the period between 2017 and 2021.

4. Notice on this bail petition was issued on 15.10.2025.

5. Ms. Shubhi Gupta, learned APP for the State has handed-up Status Report dated 09.03.2026 alongwith a copy of Nominal Roll dated 05.03.2026, which are taken on record.
6. The court has heard Mr. Amol Kokane, learned counsel for the petitioner; Ms. Shubhi Gupta, learned APP for the State; and as well as some of the complainants, who are present in court.
7. Mr. Kokane submits, that it is the admitted case of the prosecution that out of the total amount alleged to be involved in the matter, only about Rs.15 lacs were transferred by way of cheques/online transfers; and the allegation is that the entire remaining sum was paid *in cash* by various complainants.
8. Counsel further submits, that it is also the prosecution case that the aforementioned sum of Rs.15 lacs was remitted to the bank account of petitioner's father (Ravinder Kumar Pandey); and only a small sum of Rs.4 lacs is alleged to have been remitted to the petitioner's bank account.
9. Counsel argues, that the payment of cash by the complainants is alleged to have been recorded in a register, which does not bear the signatures of the petitioner against any of the amounts alleged to have been received.
10. Counsel submits, that at the relevant time the petitioner was employed with Amazon; and was transferred to Pune on 10.01.2022.Counsel submits, that the petitioner had no role in the matter and his name has been dragged in only because his father is the main accused in the case.
11. Counsel further argues, that in fact the complainants have been harassing the petitioner; that he was abducted, beaten-up and even his

flat in Chhatarpur was unlawfully transferred in favour of the some of the complainants.

12. In the circumstances, counsel prays that the petitioner be granted regular bail pending trial.

13. Opposing the grant of bail, learned APP submits, that while it is true that the remittance traced to the petitioner's account is about Rs.4 lacs, and that the petitioner had not signed on the register in which the receipt of cash amounts was recorded, however the petitioner had absconded soon after the FIR was registered.

14. The allegation of having absconded is disputed by counsel for the petitioner, submitting that at that time the petitioner was transferred by his employer Amazon, to Pune.

15. Upon query, learned APP submits that investigation in the matter is complete; and charge-sheet as well as supplementary chargesheet have been filed in the case.

16. The complainants who are present in court submit, that apart from the monies remitted *via* cheques/online transfers, large sums of money were taken by the petitioner alongwith his father in cash from month-to-month; and though the complainants were promised high rates of return, not a penny was returned.

17. The petitioner's nominal roll shows, that he has suffered judicial custody for more than 01 year and 06 months; that his jail conduct has been 'satisfactory'; and that he has been working as a *Sahayak* in prison.

18. The nominal roll also shows that the petitioner is facing proceedings in another case bearing FIR No.567/2017 registered under sections

354/451/506/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Chhawla. When asked however, learned counsel for the petitioner has handed-up a copy of order dated 22.01.2026 passed by this court in Crl.M.C.507/2026, whereby the said FIR has been quashed based on a mediated settlement *inter-alia* between the petitioner and complainant. Copy of order dated 22.01.2026 is taken on record.

19. Another case reflected in the nominal roll as pending against the petitioner is under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

20. This court would also observe, that out of the allegedly cheated amount of about Rs.3.63 crores, almost Rs.3.5 crores are alleged to have been paid by the complainants *in cash*, which payment would require to be proved in the course of the trial.

21. Upon a conspectus of the foregoing facts and circumstances, and especially the fact that the investigation in the matter is complete and chargesheet alongwith supplementary chargesheet have already been filed, this court is persuaded to allow the present petition.

22. Accordingly, petitioner – ***Prasun Pandey s/o Ravinder Kumar Pandey*** **–** is admitted to *regular bail* pending trial *subject to* the following conditions:

    22.1. The petitioner shall furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rs. Five Lacs Only) with 02 sureties in the like amount from family members, to the satisfaction of the learned trial court;

    22.2. The petitioner shall furnish to the Investigating Officer/S.H.O a cellphone number on which the petitioner may be contacted at any time and shall ensure that the number is kept active and switched-on at all times;

22.3. If the petitioner has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the learned trial court and shall not travel out of the country without prior permission of the learned trial court;

22.4. The petitioner shall not contact, nor visit, nor offer any inducement, threat or promise to any of the prosecution witnesses or other persons acquainted with the facts of case. The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that is unlawful or that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial;

22.5. In case of any change in his contact details, the petitioner shall promptly inform the I.O. in writing;

22.6. The petitioner is also directed to furnish to the I.O. the address on which he would be residing within or outside Delhi; with a further direction that the petitioner would inform the I.O. in writing prior to changing his residential address; and

22.7. Since the petitioner is facing trial and would therefore be appearing before the learned trial court from time-to-time, it is not considered necessary to impose a reporting requirement as a condition of regular bail.

23. Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the pending matter.

24. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent *forthwith*.

25. The petition stands disposed-of in the above terms.

26. Other pending applications, if any, are also disposed-of.

**ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J**

**MARCH 9, 2026**
ds