



2026:DHC:6224



\$~72

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

%

Date of Decision: 03.08.2026# **CNR No. DLHC010346382026**+ **BAIL APPLN. 3052/2026, CRL.M.A. 23070/2026 & CRL.M.A. 23071/2026**

PARITOSH TIWARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kshitiz Mahipal, Advocate

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State
with SI Arun Kumar**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 349/2021 of PS Vijay Vihar for offence under Section 420/465/467/468/471/120B/34 IPC.
2. At the outset, learned APP for State points out that vide order dated 17.02.2026, after addressing partly, the accused/applicant had withdrawn the bail application and there is no change in circumstances.



3. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the change in circumstances is that now chargesheet has been filed. But, the Investigating Officer/SI Arun Kumar submits that investigation *qua* the accused/applicant is still continuing because subsequent to 17.02.2026, three of the accused persons who had become proclaimed offender were arrested and their police custody is being sought today itself.

4. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is that he is a part of a group of accused persons, who cheated innocent aspirants for government job and made them part away substantial amounts on the promise of getting them job in the Indian Railways. Not only this, the accused persons even forged the recruitment letters and handed over the same to the victims after taking money from them.

5. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that his role is limited to the extent that he forwarded over phone copies of the allegedly forged appointment letters to the victims. It is submitted by learned counsel that the accused/applicant had no reason to believe that copies of those appointment letters are the forged copies.

6. But learned counsel for accused/applicant also does not dispute that the accused/applicant was not employed with the government so as to entitle him to access the appointment letters. This in itself, *prima facie*, reflects complicity of the accused/applicant, though on this aspect, the trial court shall take independent view on the basis of evidence adduced during trial.



2026:DHC:6224



7. Further, learned prosecutor also submits that the accused/applicant is involved in another case bearing FIR No.559/2024 of PS Keshav Puram on similar allegations as in the present case.

8. Keeping in mind the above circumstances, especially the nature of allegations and stage of investigation into the expanse of the offence, I do not find it a fit case at this stage to grant bail. The bail application and the accompanying applications are dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 03, 2026_{/as}