



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4482/2025**

KARMANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Katiyar and Mr. Kushal
Sinha, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP.
Insp Narasi Prasad Meena.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **24.02.2026**

1. By way of this application, the applicant seeks anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 582/2025 dated 19.08.2025, registered at Police Station I.G.I. Airport, under Sections 318(4), 336(3), and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ["BNS"], as well as Section 12 of the Passports Act, 1967.

2. I have heard Mr. Varun Katiyar, learned counsel for the applicant, and Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The State has filed a status report dated 12.01.2026, setting out the current status of the present case, which reads as follows:

- a) A passenger, namely Aayush Raj Verma, was apprehended at I.G.I. Airport on 19.08.2025 upon his arrival from the United Kingdom ["UK"], as he was found to be in possession of certain educational documents which appeared, *prima facie*, to be suspicious.
- b) During the course of interrogation, the passenger stated that the



said documents had been provided to him by an agent for the purpose of obtaining a student visa for the UK.

- c) The passenger was thereafter arrested and subjected to interrogation. During the course of interrogation, he disclosed the names of two persons, namely Satwant Singh and Talwinder Singh, as the agents who had arranged the aforesaid documents and facilitated the procurement of his UK visa. He further stated that he had paid a sum of Rs. 7,50,000/- to Satwant Singh and Rs. 8,50,000/- to Talwinder Singh in this regard.
- d) The documents recovered from Aayush Raj Verma were forwarded to the concerned universities/institutions for verification, and upon such verification, were found to be forged.
- e) The co-accused, Talwinder Singh, was arrested on 24.08.2025. During interrogation, he stated that he had prepared the aforesaid documents and transmitted the PDF files to Satwant Singh, who, in turn, arranged for printouts through another agent and thereafter sent the same to the passenger.
- f) Talwinder Singh was remanded to judicial custody on 24.08.2025.
- g) Satwant Singh joined the investigation on 29.08.2025 and was thereafter arrested. During the course of investigation, he stated that the forged documents had been prepared by Talwinder Singh in association with the present applicant. He further stated that his role was limited to obtaining printouts of the said documents and forwarding the same to Talwinder Singh and his associates. During police remand, Satwant Singh additionally disclosed that he had introduced Aayush Raj Verma to Talwinder Singh.



- h) Pursuant to the disclosure made by Satwant Singh, one Dharmendra Kumar @ Dharmendra Singh @ DK was apprehended, and 7 passports, papers containing transaction details, and other incriminating documents were seized from his possession. During interrogation, he named another agent, namely Ram, as the person who had arranged the forged documents. Dharmendra Kumar @ Dharmendra Singh @ DK was thereafter arrested in the present case.
- i) Pursuant to the disclosure made by Dharmendra Kumar @ Dharmendra Singh @ DK, a raid was conducted on 03.09.2025 at the residence of one Durgeshwar Singh @ Ram. During the course of the raid, printed stationery of various institutions, more than 100 stamps of colleges, schools, and universities, fake marksheets, printing machines, a lamination machine, and several mobile phones were seized. During interrogation, he is stated to have admitted that he had been preparing forged marksheets for various clients. Durgeshwar Singh @ Ram was subsequently granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Court on 11.09.2025.
- j) Insofar as the present applicant is concerned, the status report states that he was actively involved in arranging forged documents for Aayush Raj Verma. It is further stated that the Call Detail Records [“CDRs”] reflect frequent telephonic contact between the present applicant and the co-accused, namely Satwant Singh, Aayush Raj Verma, and Talwinder Singh.
4. The applicant had earlier approached the learned Sessions Court seeking interim protection. Interim protection was granted to him on



16.09.2025. However, his application for anticipatory bail was ultimately dismissed by the learned Sessions Court *vide* order dated 19.11.2025, in view of an allegation that he was not cooperating with the investigation, as he had denied any acquaintance with the co-accused despite the CDRs indicating otherwise. His plea seeking parity with the co-accused, Durgeshwar Singh @ Ram, was also rejected on the ground that the said co-accused is a person with disability.

5. Mr. Katiyar submits that the only allegation levelled against the applicant emanates from the statement of co-accused Satwant Singh, wherein the applicant has been named merely as an associate of Talwinder Singh. He submits that Talwinder Singh himself has not attributed any specific role to the applicant in the commission of the alleged offence. It is further contended that all relevant documents in the present case have already been recovered, and that all the other co-accused, including Satwant Singh, Talwinder Singh, Aayush Raj Verma, Dharmendra Singh, and Durgeshwar Singh, have since been granted bail or anticipatory bail.

6. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, opposes the application, submitting that the allegations are serious in nature and have wider ramifications. She submits that the case pertains to the preparation of forged educational documents allegedly used for facilitating illegal immigration, which cannot be viewed lightly. She further contends that the applicant has not cooperated with the investigation, inasmuch as his statements during interrogation are inconsistent with the CDRs.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon



consideration of the material on record, I am of the view that the present case is a fit one for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant, for the reasons set out hereinbelow:

- a) Even according to the prosecution, the role attributed to the applicant in the alleged offence is that of an associate of co-accused Talwinder Singh, as disclosed in the statement of co-accused Satwant Singh. The passenger, Aayush Raj Verma, named only Satwant Singh and Talwinder Singh as the persons who had arranged the documents in question and to whom he had paid sums of Rs. 7,50,000/- and Rs. 8,50,000/- respectively. The name of the applicant does not figure either in the disclosure statement of the passenger or in the statement made by Talwinder Singh. This position is also confirmed by Ms. Arya upon instructions from the Investigating Officer.
- b) Further, even as per the prosecution's case, the principal allegations of preparing and facilitating forged documents for the passenger are attributed to Satwant Singh, Talwinder Singh, Dharmendra Singh, and Durgeshwar Singh. All of the aforesaid co-accused have been granted bail or anticipatory bail. *Prima facie*, the role attributed to the applicant does not appear to be graver than that attributed to the said co-accused.
- c) The documents allegedly used by Aayush Raj Verma have already been recovered. In addition, fake passports, notebooks, stamps, and other incriminating materials have been recovered from Dharmendra Singh and Durgeshwar Singh. No further recovery is stated to be required from the present applicant.



- d) The only *prima facie* material presently relied upon against the applicant consists of telephonic communications between him and Satwant Singh, Aayush Raj Verma, and Talwinder Singh. The relevant CDRs are already in the possession of the prosecution.
- e) The contention regarding alleged non-cooperation with the investigation, which found favour with the learned Sessions Court, does not commend to me. Cooperation with the investigation cannot be construed to mean an obligation on the part of the accused to make self-incriminatory statements. This position has been reiterated by the Supreme Court in *Bijender v. State of Haryana*¹, *Hemant Kumar v. State of Haryana*² and, more recently, in *Vinay Kumar Gupta v. State of Madhya Pradesh*³.
8. For the aforesaid reasons, the application is allowed. It is directed that, in the event of arrest in connection with FIR No. 582/2025 dated 19.08.2025, registered at Police Station I.G.I. Airport under Sections 318(4), 336(3), and 340(2) of BNS and Section 12 of the Passports Act, 1967, the applicant shall be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Station House Officer, and subject to the following conditions:
- a. The applicant shall report to the Investigating Officer on 26.02.2026 at 04:00 PM and shall thereafter join and cooperate with the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer;

¹ SLP (Crl.) 1079/2024, decided on 06.03.2024.

² SLP (Crl.) 232/2024, decided on 06.03.2024.



- b. The applicant shall furnish his mobile number to the Investigating Officer and shall ensure that the said mobile phone remains operational and switched on at all times. The mobile number shall not be changed, nor shall the phone be switched off, without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer;
 - c. The applicant shall furnish his residential address to the Investigating Officer and shall not change the same without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer;
 - d. The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or attempt to contact any witness, nor shall he tamper with the evidence in any manner whatsoever;
 - e. The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Trial Court;
 - f. The applicant shall not commit any offence during the pendency of the proceedings.
9. The bail application stands disposed of in the above terms.
10. It is clarified that the observations made herein are solely for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application, and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, nor shall they prejudice the rights and contentions of the parties at any stage of the proceedings.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2026
SS/SD/

³ SLP (Crl.) 20215/2025, decided on 16.02.2026.