



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 4928/2025**
SUNIL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. B.S. Chowdhary, Advocate
(through V.C.).

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State
with ASI Mohd. Javed.
Ms. Gayatri Nandwani, (DHCLSC)
Standing Counsel.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
19.03.2026

%

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in a case arising out of FIR No.0494/2025 dated 02.12.2025, for commission of offences under Sections 318(4)/336(3)/340(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)*, 2023 (corresponding Sections 420/468/471 IPC), registered at P.S. Jafrabad, Delhi.
2. The applicant is owner of vehicle bearing No. DL1LAH7978 ("*Chhota Haathi*"). On 01.12.2025, the abovesaid vehicle was stopped by Traffic Officials for committing violation i.e. entering "No Entry Zone". However, the driver i.e. Deepak relied on 'Entry Permit', put on the windshield of the abovesaid vehicle and replied that as per such certificate, the vehicle was having permission for plying the same in said zone and was valid upto 31.12.2025.

BAIL APPLN. 4928/2025

1



3. Fact remains that when the investigation was carried out, it was found that the abovesaid certificate, purportedly issued by DCP, Traffic Headquarter, New Delhi was a forged and fabricated one, as no such certificate was ever issued by the abovesaid authority.
4. Said Deepak, when further interrogated, claimed that he was driving the abovesaid vehicle for only three days and when the applicant, being owner of the abovesaid vehicle was interrogated, he revealed that the vehicle was earlier being driven by one Driver Satish but fact remains that he could not reveal the contact details of his such previous driver.
5. Learned APP for the State has submitted a comprehensive status report and submits that the custodial interrogation of the applicant would be imperative, as it has to be found out as to from where the abovesaid fake certificate was got prepared or procured. She submits that despite being owner of the vehicle, the applicant is trying to come up with lame excuses and he cannot be permitted to put the burden upon his driver whose details, even, have not been divulged.
6. During consideration of the matter, the case diary was also produced by concerned I.O. and the Court has also seen the, allegedly, forged permission/certificate. Fabrication of such official document cannot be taken in a causal manner.
7. According to learned APP for the State, though accused had joined the investigation but he did not cooperate and did not disclose the complete whereabouts of the abovesaid driver, a daily wager and, therefore, it is prayed that the applicant does not deserve anticipatory bail.
8. Keeping in mind the seriousness of the matter and to reach to the root of the matter, this Court is also of the view that the custodial interrogation of



the applicant would be very much required.

9. In view of the above, present application is, hereby, dismissed.

10. The interim protection granted to the applicant stands withdrawn accordingly.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MARCH 19, 2026/ss/sa