



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4509/2025**

NARESH CHANDRA PRADHANPetitioner

Through: Mr. Nishant Kumar Saxena, Mr.
Vijayant Sharma and Mr. V.
Chauhan, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHIRespondent

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP for the State.
Mr. Dinhar Takiar, Advocate for
complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

04.02.2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.151/2023 dated 12.06.2023 registered under sections 419/420/467/468/471/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at P.S.: Special Cell, Delhi.

2. Notice on the petition was issued on 24.11.2025.
3. Status Report dated 12.01.2026 has been filed.
4. The court has heard Mr. Nishant Kumar Saxena, learned counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Shubhi Gupta, learned APP for the State as well as Mr. Dinhar Takiar, learned counsel for the complainant.
5. At the very outset, Ms. Gupta informs the court that the petitioner has been declared a proclaimed person ('absconder') *vidé* order dated 30.07.2025 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.



6. In this behalf, learned APP has drawn attention to the run of events as set-out in the status report, to further argue that the petitioner was fully aware that the remittance of Rs. 25 lacs received in his account did not belong to him and the said credit entry only came to be reversed after intervention of the police.
7. Furthermore, she has pointed to the fact that despite notice having been served upon the petitioner under section 41-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and despite the fact that the petitioner was represented before the learned Magistrate, he neither joined investigation nor did he appear before the learned Magistrate, which led to the issuance of non-bailable warrants against him, culminating in the passing of the order declaring him proclaimed person ('absconder').
8. It is accordingly submitted that in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Srikant Upadhyay vs. State of Bihar*¹, the anticipatory bail petition is not maintainable.
9. Based on the submissions made, and in particular, the fact that it appears that the petitioner was aware of the transaction that led to the credit of the sum of Rs. 25 lacs into the account of his company - Rising Sun Aromas Spirituals Pvt. Ltd., this court is not inclined to grant relief to the petitioner in the present proceedings.
10. The petition is accordingly dismissed.
11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 4, 2026

ds

¹ (2024) 12 SCC 382