



2026:DHC:5435



\$~4

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

Decided on: 07.07.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3916/2025**

SUDHEER

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tom Joseph, Mr. Nishe Rajen
Shonker, and Ms. Anugrah Sabu,
Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Akhand Pratap Singh, SPP,
Mr. Nishank Tripathi, Ms. Harshita
Sukhija, Ms. Rishika Agarwal, Mr.
Shreyan Srivastav, Ms. Samridhi
Dobhal, Ms. Krishna Mohan
Chandel, Mr. Hritwik Maurya, Ms.
Lisa Pagwal, Ms. Apoorv Paliya,
Mr. Utkarsh Singh, Advocates for
State with ACP Virender Kadyan,
Insp. Pradeep Rai.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

J U D G M E N T

PRATEEK JALAN, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of the present application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]), the petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 208/2021, dated 07.08.2021, registered at Police Station Special Cell, Delhi, under Sections 170/384/385/388/419/420/506/120B of the Indian Penal Code,



1860 [“IPC”], and Section 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 [“IT Act”]. At the time of filing of the chargesheet, Sections 3 and 4 of the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999 [“MCOCA”], were also invoked.

2. This is the first bail application filed by the petitioner before this Court. He had earlier filed a bail application before the Special Court, which was dismissed *vide* order dated 23.08.2025.

3. I have heard Mr. Tom Joseph, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Sanjay Jain, learned Senior Counsel for the State. The State has also filed a status report, which is on record.

4. At the outset, it may be mentioned that I have recently decided three bail applications arising out of the same proceedings, filed by co-accused Leena Paulose [hereinafter, “Leena”], Deepak Ramnani [hereinafter, “Deepak”], and Pradeep Ramdanee [hereinafter, “Pradeep”]. The application filed by Leena¹ was dismissed, whereas the applications filed by Deepak² and Pradeep³ were allowed.

I. PROSECUTION CASE:

5. The prosecution case, as it appears from the material on record, is as follows:

- a. FIR No. 208/2021, dated 07.08.2021, lodged at Police Station Special Cell, Delhi, under Sections 170/384/385/388/419/420/506/120B of the IPC and Section 66D of the IT Act, was registered at the instance of one Ms. Aditi Singh.

¹ BAIL APPLN. 1802/2024, decided on 05.05.2026, [hereinafter, “Leena Paulose”]. An earlier application for bail filed by Leena in the State proceedings [BAIL APPLN. 3706/2022] was also rejected by judgment dated 11.07.2023.

² BAIL APPLN. 4286/2024, decided on 05.06.2026 [hereinafter, “Deepak Ramnani”].



2026:DHC:5435



- b. According to the complaint, on 15.06.2020, the complainant received a call on her mobile phone from a landline number. The caller introduced himself as a senior officer in the Ministry of Law and offered assistance in securing bail for her husband, who was in judicial custody in cases related to M/s Religare Enterprises Limited.
- c. It is alleged that the caller demanded Rs. 50 crores in exchange for facilitating the bail and explained the method of delivering the money.
- d. Subsequently, through his associates, the caller allegedly extorted money from the complainant on multiple occasions between June 2020 and August 2021, amounting to a total of Rs. 217 crores. There are further allegations with regard to impersonation of senior officials, including the Home Secretary, Government of India, and misrepresenting the involvement of other government functionaries, including the Home Minister.
- e. Acting on the said information, on 07.08.2021, the police laid a trap and apprehended Pradeep, while he was receiving the extorted amount. He was arrested on the same day. During interrogation, he disclosed that he was acting on the instructions of his brother, Deepak, who was subsequently arrested on 08.08.2021.
- f. Using technical surveillance of the mobile phone used for making the calls, and the statements of co-accused, the caller was identified as one Sukesh Chandra Shekhar @ Sukash Chandra Shekhar [hereinafter, "Sukesh"].

³ BAIL APPLN. 4441/2024, decided on 05.06.2026.



- g. At this time, Sukesh was already lodged in Tihar Jail as an undertrial prisoner in a separate case, involving allegations of collecting money from a political leader on the pretext of helping him retain a particular election symbol. He was later shifted to Rohini Jail.
- h. A raid was conducted on the intervening night of 07/08.08.2021 by the Special Cell, during which two mobile phones were recovered from Sukesh, while he was in custody, and he was formally arrested in connection with the present FIR. His interrogation led to the identification and arrest of other associates and co-conspirators. The petitioner was arrested on 20.07.2024.
- i. During investigation, it was found that Sukesh was involved in multiple cases, including attempt to murder, criminal intimidation, cheating, and extortion, often by impersonating high-ranking officials.
- j. Part of the extorted amount was allegedly transmitted by Sukesh, through *hawala* channels, to his wife, Leena, in Chennai.
- k. As far as the present petitioner is concerned, his role in the aforesaid offences is summarised in the chargesheet⁴ as follows:

“Role of accused Sudheer

During investigation, it has emerged that accused Sudheer was an important part of crime syndicate run by accused Sukash Chandra Sekhar. He was helping mastermind of the crime syndicate, accused Sukash Chandra Sekhar and his wife/co-accused Leena Paulose in parking of crime proceeds. He is an old trusted associate of accused Sukash Chandra Shekhar and Leena Paulose and was well aware about the activities of the crime syndicate.

⁴ 5th Supplementary chargesheet dated 04.10.2024.



During investigation at that time, it was found that accused Sudheer remained involved in unlawful activities of crime syndicate and efforts were made to examine him, but he deliberately avoided his joining investigation and kept on absconding continuously. Since, sufficient evidence against accused Sudheer have come on record, hence, Notices u/s 41A Cr.P.C. were issued to him for joining the investigation at that time. However, despite repeated efforts, he never joined the investigation. Accordingly, his NBW was got obtained from the Hon'ble Court and proceedings U/s 82 Cr.P.C. were also initiated. Finally, on 10-04-2024, the Hon'ble Trial Court declared him a proclaimed person.

During investigation, accused Leena Paulose in her disclosure statement stated that B. Mohan Raj and Sudheer were very close to Sukash Chandra Shekhar. Sudheer and accused Joel Daniel used to stay with her in August-2020 at her ECR House Chennai. Sudheer and Joel used to collect cash from Hawala operators on the instructions of Sukash Chandra Shekhar and further delivered it to different persons including B. Mohan Raj as per the directions of Sukash Chandra Shekhar and Leena Paulose.

Further, another accused Arun Muthu also disclosed that Leena Paulose with the help of B. Mohanraj, Sudheer and Joel Daniel used to convert cash into bank entries through card swapping etc. Accused Sukash Chandra Shekhar in his confessional statement U/s 18 MCOC Act also disclosed that cash was received from a sow carpet firms, Chennai and same was collected by Sudheer and Joel Daniel. This cash was delivered to B. Mohanraj. Accused B. Mohanraj in his confessional statement U/s 18 MCOC Act disclosed that the cash was handed over by Sudheer to Kamlesh Kothari at Kamlesh Kothari's office for buying high end cars.”

II. STATEMENTS UNDER SECTION 18 OF MCOCA:

6. In support of the above allegations, the State relied upon confessional statements under Section 18 of MCOCA made by co-accused Sukesh, B. Mohanraj [hereinafter, “Mohanraj”], and the petitioner himself.

7. The statements of Sukesh, Mohanraj and the petitioner, insofar as they are relevant, are summarised as follows:



A. Confessional statement under Section 18 MCOCA of Sukesh:

Sukesh stated that he had informed Leena about the whole plan and told her to take precautions to avoid trouble with the agencies. He told her that the cash will reach her through *hawala*, and Deepak will be helping them. He further told her that the cash will be delivered to pre-decided locations, and can be used to purchase luxury cars and valuable articles. He also told her to brief each of their aides. The said cash was received at Sow carpet, Chennai and collected by the petitioner and Joel Daniel [hereinafter, “Joel”]. Cash was delivered to Mohanraj and he further delivered it to Kamlesh Kothari [hereinafter, “Kamlesh”] and Arun Muthu [hereinafter, “Arun”]. Arun deals in providing bank entries and Kamlesh deals in purchasing high ends cars and house.

B. Confessional statement under Section 18 MCOCA of Mohanraj:

Mohanraj stated that Sukesh wanted to purchase two cars for his wife, and informed him about sellers of the cars, and that he wanted the cars to be bought under some other name. Kamlesh arranged two buyers for the same. Sukesh sent cash through the petitioner, who handed it over to Kamlesh at Kamlesh’s office.

C. Confessional statement under Section 18 MCOCA of petitioner:

The petitioner stated that he was working in Dubai from 1999 to 2016. After returning from Dubai in 2016, he had no work. He thereafter met Leena, who employed him as a driver in Thrissur for a remuneration of Rs. 25,000/-. In August-September 2017, Leena shifted him to work at her ECR Road house in Chennai as a driver, where he was helping with other household tasks as well. His



2026:DHC:5435



renumeration had also increased to Rs. 35,000/-. Over the course of his employment, he became a trusted associate of Leena, who then informed him about Sukesh. Leena also told him about a pending case against her and Sukesh, and that Sukesh was in jail. Leena used to buy him expensive clothes and phones. Leena informed him that she was looking for a trusted associate, who would help her and Sukesh in hiding the money made through crime, for which they would pay handsomely in return. At first, he refused, but upon assurances from Leena that he would not face any problems, and would also get a higher pay, he accepted her offer to join their group. Leena and Sukesh used to speak to him through WhatsApp, and would never take normal calls from him. Between 2018-2020, he visited Delhi multiple times on the instructions of Leena, and stayed at hotels near Delhi Airport or Tihar Jail. He visited Tihar Jail officially to meet Sukesh on multiple occasions and passed on Leena's messages to him. His work in Delhi involved providing clothes and food to Sukesh in jail. He used to wait outside, from where jail officials used to take the clothes and food from him. Sukesh had all the facilities in jail, including a room to himself, as well as a phone and laptop. Whenever the petitioner was in need of money, he was provided with a token number and a phone number from Leena or Sukesh, and upon calling that phone number and providing the token number, he used to receive the money. Sukesh and Leena sent a lot of money to him, which he used to deliver to Mohanraj and Arun on their instructions, who used to adjust the proceeds of crime in Salon Nail Artistry and Super Car company.



The petitioner and Joel were tasked with getting cash and delivering it to Mohanraj, Arun, and sometimes Leena. The petitioner used to collect the *hawala* cash from Sow Carpet, Chennai, as well as other places. Pursuant to a raid in Sukesh's jail cell, Leena instructed the petitioner to go underground for 2-3 months. He thereafter stayed underground in Ajmer Sharif and Jaipur. Later, Leena called him back to Chennai. Leena purchased a new house in ECR Road in Chennai with the help of Mohanraj, Kamlesh and Arun. During the time of purchase, the petitioner had made a delivery through the token system of more than Rs. 7 Crores in cash to Kamlesh at his office. During July-August 2020, Sukesh and Leena were moving money worth crores, and the petitioner told Leena about the risk of collecting such high volume of money, but he was told that Sukesh was cheating a big person and that he would also get a good amount of money. Out of this money, a large portion was used to make the new house beautiful and purchase of cars. Whenever Sukesh used to be in Chennai on interim bail, Arun, Mohanraj, Kamlesh and Joel used to visit him, and discuss about plans to handle the money received through *hawala*. The petitioner used to receive money either in cash or in his wife's account. Upon Sukesh's arrest, the petitioner was on the run for three years. He wanted to go to Saudi Arabia for work, but was caught.

III. SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES:

8. Mr. Joseph's principal submission is that the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of parity with co-accused Joel, who was granted bail by the



Special Court *vide* order dated 21.11.2022. He submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are substantially similar to those levelled against Joel, inasmuch as both were merely salaried employees of Leena, who were entrusted with the task of collecting cash and delivering it to other individuals, as instructed, or other menial tasks.

9. Mr. Joseph further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 20.07.2024, and has thus been in custody for a period of nearly two years. Charges have recently been framed, by an order of the Special Court dated 03.06.2026. However, the State has cited 403 witnesses, and the chargesheets collectively exceed 10,000 pages. Further, one of the co-accused, Navas KI, has been arrested recently, and it is likely that a supplementary chargesheet will have to be filed in relation to his case. Considering the aforesaid factors, Mr. Joseph submitted that the petitioner's right to a speedy trial, guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution, has been defeated, and his continued custody pending trial is constitutionally unjustifiable.

10. Mr. Joseph further submitted that the legal position with regard to prolonged incarceration, *vis-à-vis* the restrictions on grant of bail under Section 21(4) of MCOCA, has been considered at length in the judgments in *Leena Paulose* and *Deepak Ramnani*. Applying the same yardstick to the present case, he submitted that the Court is required to examine the role attributed to the petitioner and the *prima facie* material supporting the allegations against him, to adjudicate whether his further custody is warranted. In this context, Mr. Joseph argued that, even according to the prosecution, the petitioner's role was limited to handling the allegedly extorted funds. He played no role in the planning or execution of the



foundational offence of extortion, but only in delivery of the funds sent by Sukesh to Leena in Chennai.

11. Mr. Jain, on the other hand, submitted that the petitioner has remained in custody for less than two years in connection with offences punishable with imprisonment for life. He therefore contended that the petitioner cannot claim the benefit of prolonged incarceration.

12. Mr. Jain submitted that the petitioner had a direct role in handling of the extorted funds in Chennai, with full knowledge of the illegal activities of the Organised Crime Syndicate [hereinafter, "OCS"]. He was thus not only involved in abetment of the activities of the OCS, but was also directly involved in the "*continuing unlawful activities*", within the meaning of Section 2(1)(d) of MCOCA, which clearly demonstrates "*membership*" of the OCS under Section 3(4) of MCOCA. He submitted that the petitioner participated in disposal of the proceeds of crime, and also collection of money from *hawala* channels, and delivery to pre-determined associates on the instructions of Leena and Sukesh. In further support of this contention, he pointed out that the petitioner had visited Sukesh in Tihar Jail on five occasions, and had travelled with him on fourteen chartered flights. He also referred to the scrutiny of the bank account of the petitioner's wife, which revealed the receipt of Rs. 9 lakhs from M/s Stash Wear Pvt. Ltd., a company allegedly belonging to Arun.

13. Mr. Jain submitted that, at the stage of consideration of bail, statements recorded under Section 18 of MCOCA cannot be discarded merely because they have subsequently been retracted, the effect of such retraction being a matter for trial. In support, he relied upon the judgments of this Court rejecting the bail applications of co-accused



2026:DHC:5435



Leena⁵. He emphasised that, according to the statements of Sukesh and the petitioner himself, the petitioner was a key participant in facilitating the disposal of proceeds of crime and in providing Sukesh with clothes and food while he was lodged in jail. He further referred to Mohanraj's statement, to contend that the petitioner had acted as a conduit for transferring funds utilised for the purchase of luxury cars for Leena.

14. Lastly, Mr. Jain submitted that the petitioner had absconded for nearly three years and was eventually declared a proclaimed offender by the Special Court, *vide* order dated 10.04.2023. He also submitted that the petitioner was apprehended near the Indo-Nepal border pursuant to a Look Out Circular issued against him. According to him, these circumstances militate against the grant of bail to the petitioner.

15. In rejoinder, Mr. Joseph disputed the allegation that the petitioner had absconded for three years. He submitted that the petitioner was first named as a suspect, only in the fourth supplementary chargesheet dated 21.08.2023 and was subsequently arraigned as an accused in the fifth supplementary chargesheet dated 04.10.2024, although he had already been arrested on 20.07.2024. He further contended that the fact that the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender does not, by itself, disentitle him from being considered for regular bail. He also submitted that the petitioner's wife and children are permanently settled in Kerala, demonstrating that he has deep roots in society.

16. Mr. Joseph further submitted that, while granting bail to Joel, the Special Court had specifically considered the evidentiary value of the

⁵ BAIL APPLN. 3706/2022, decided on 11.07.2023 and BAIL APPLN. 1802/2024, decided on 05.05.2026.



statements recorded under Section 18 of MCOCA and their subsequent retraction. He pointed out that the said order has not been challenged by the prosecution and has thus attained finality. On that basis, he reiterated the petitioner's claim for parity.

17. In response to the allegation regarding his meetings with Sukesh in jail, Mr. Joseph submitted that such "*associative proximity*" was also considered by this Court in *Deepak Ramnani*. He further pointed out that the alleged acts of extortion were committed in Rohini Jail, whereas his visits were to Sukesh in Tihar Jail, which further dilutes the significance of those meetings.

IV. ANALYSIS

18. The principal questions raised by Mr. Joseph, in support of the present application, are based on the grounds of prolonged incarceration and parity with co-accused Joel. In order to adjudicate these questions, it is appropriate to analyse the prosecution allegations against the petitioner.

19. At the outset, it is clear that the prosecution does not attribute any role in the planning or execution of the foundational offence of extortion to the petitioner. According to the prosecution, the petitioner was a salaried employee of Leena, primarily working as her driver. It is alleged that he facilitated the disposal of the proceeds of crime by collecting money received through *hawala* channels, and delivering it to persons designated by Leena and Sukesh. More specifically, the petitioner is alleged to have, alongwith Joel, collected cash from Sow Carpet, Chennai, and delivered it to Mohanraj. It is further alleged that, acting on Sukesh's instructions, he delivered a substantial amount of cash to Kamlesh at his office for the purchase of luxury cars. The prosecution



also relies upon the transfer of Rs. 9 lakhs by M/s Stash Wear Pvt. Ltd., allegedly owned by Arun, into the bank account of the petitioner's wife. In addition, it is alleged that the petitioner visited Sukesh in Tihar Jail on five occasions, regularly supplied him with clothes and food through jail officials, and travelled with him on 14 chartered flights.

20. While granting bail to Joel, the Special Court noticed that he was also a salaried employee of Leena, who facilitated the collection and distribution of the alleged proceeds of crime received from Sukesh. It was alleged that he collected money through *hawala* channels on the instructions of Leena and Mohanraj and delivered the same to designated persons. Having considered the material in the context of the twin conditions under Section 21(4) of MCOCA, the Special Court ultimately concluded that Joel was entitled to bail. I am informed that the said order has not been challenged and has, therefore, attained finality.

21. Viewed holistically, the role attributed to the petitioner is, *prima facie*, substantially similar to that attributed to Joel. In both cases, the allegation is that they were salaried employees of Leena who acted under the instructions of Leena and Sukesh, and facilitated the movement and delivery of the alleged proceeds of crime through *hawala* channels. There is no suggestion that the petitioner had any decision-making responsibility, as far as collection of the amounts or their distribution is concerned. He, like Joel, was acting upon the instructions of Sukesh and Leena. To the extent that the petitioner was also allegedly travelling with Sukesh or providing him with clothes and food while he was in jail, I do not consider these factors to make a determinative difference to the case. They underscore his role as a salaried employee, responsible for fulfilling



the demands of his employers. The fact that he was trusted by the employers, and frequently travelled with Sukesh, do not detract from this overall analysis, and are really facets of “*associative proximity*”, which has also been considered in *Deepak Ramnani*, while granting bail to the accused therein.

22. Turning next to the ground of prolonged incarceration, I am unable to accept the submission of Mr. Jain that the petitioner is disentitled to invoke Article 21 of the Constitution, merely because he has undergone custody for a period of less than two years, in respect of offences punishable with imprisonment for life. Although the period of incarceration undergone in the cases of co-accused Deepak and Pradeep, who have been granted bail by this Court⁶, was substantially higher, the question of prolonged incarceration cannot be determined by a rigid formula. Whether continued incarceration has become excessive, must necessarily be assessed on the facts of each case.

23. In *Leena Paulose*, and subsequently in *Deepak Ramnani*, this Court had occasion to consider the interplay between the constitutional guarantee under Article 21 and the statutory restrictions on the grant of bail under Section 21(4) of MCOCA. The position that emerges from those decisions is that the statutory embargo cannot eclipse a constitutionally protected claim founded upon prolonged pre-trial incarceration. At the same time, prolonged incarceration is not a standalone consideration. The Court is required to examine the period of custody in conjunction with the nature of the offence, the role attributed

⁶ BAIL APPLN. 4286/2024 and BAIL APPLN. 4441/2024, decided *vide* a common judgment dated 05.06.2026.



to the accused, the strength of the *prima facie* case, and the realistic possibility of the trial concluding within a reasonable time.

24. As noted above, the main allegation against the petitioner is that, being a salaried employee of Leena, he acted as a conduit in handling and delivering the alleged proceeds of crime pursuant to the instructions of Leena and Sukesh. The statements of other co-accused, and of witnesses relied upon by the prosecution, do not *prima facie* accord any higher role to the petitioner than this. As against this, the petitioner has undergone incarceration as an undertail of almost two years. This period is substantially higher than the period undergone by Joel when he was released on bail, which was approximately 14 months. The offence under Section 3(4) of MCOCA carries a sentence which may extend to imprisonment of five years to life imprisonment. However, the proceedings have only recently reached the stage of framing of charges. The prosecution proposes to examine as many as 403 witnesses, and the chargesheets collectively exceed 10,000 pages. In addition, one of the co-accused, Navas KI, has only recently been arrested, making the filing of a further supplementary chargesheet a distinct possibility. Thus, an expeditious conclusion of the trial is unlikely. Although I have held, in *Leena Paulose*⁷, that the delay in the present case cannot be attributed to prosecutorial delays or court inaction alone, I am of the view that the role ascribed to the petitioner by the prosecution does not justify his further incarceration as an undertrial.

25. Lastly, the petitioner's conduct in absconding and his subsequent declaration as a proclaimed offender does not persuade me to a contrary



conclusion. While such conduct is definitely to be deprecated, it cannot, by itself, justify his continued incarceration for an indefinite period. As noticed above, the petitioner has remained in custody for nearly two years, and there is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future. Further, the nature of the allegations and the role attributed to the petitioner must be viewed holistically while considering the question of bail. The petitioner's past conduct is, therefore, one of the factors to be weighed in the overall balancing exercise under Article 21, but it cannot, in the facts of the present case, be treated as conclusive, so as to ignore all other relevant considerations. Instead of subjecting the petitioner to further pre-trial custody, I am of the view that the apprehension that the petitioner may evade the process of law, can be addressed by imposing stringent conditions to secure his presence during trial, including periodic requirement of reporting to the police authorities.

26. Having regard to the aforesaid considerations, including parity between the role attributed to the petitioner and that of Joel, the period of incarceration already undergone, the unlikely prospect of an early conclusion of the trial, and the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, I am of the view that this is a fit case for the grant of bail.

V. CONCLUSION

27. The application is allowed, and it is directed that the petitioner be released on bail in connection with FIR No. 208/2021, dated 07.08.2021, registered at Police Station Special Cell, Delhi, subject to furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 2,00,000/-, alongwith two sureties in the like

⁷ Paragraph 37.



2026:DHC:5435



amount, to the satisfaction of the concerned Special Court/Duty Magistrate, and subject to the following further conditions:

- a. The petitioner shall appear before the Special Court on each and every date of hearing;
- b. The petitioner shall surrender his passport before the Special Court, and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court;
- c. The petitioner shall provide his permanent address to the concerned Court, as also the address where he is residing during the pendency of the case. The petitioner shall intimate the Investigating Officer ["IO"], and file an affidavit before the Special Court, regarding any change in residential address;
- d. The petitioner shall provide his mobile number to the concerned IO/Station House Officer, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The mobile number shall not be switched off or changed without prior intimation to the IO during the pendency of the trial;
- e. The petitioner shall report to the jurisdictional Police Station near his place of residence every Monday and Thursday at 04:00 PM, and will be released within two hours, after completion of formalities.
- f. The petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any 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;
- g. The petitioner shall not commit any offence during the period of



2026:DHC:5435



his release.

28. It is made clear that any violation of the aforesaid conditions may result in cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner.

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

30. It is clarified that any observations made in the present judgment 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.

31. Copy of the judgment be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent electronically for information and necessary compliance.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 7, 2026
SS/AD/KA/