



2026:DHC:1969



§~3

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

%

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 549/2025**

RAVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuj Chauhan, Mr. Sunil Yadav
and Ms. Geetika Verma, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with Inspector Vishal Choudhary, PS
EOW.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 273/2019 of Police Station EOW for offence under Section 406/409/420/120B IPC.
2. This bail application for the first time was listed before the predecessor bench on 10.02.2025 and thereafter, remained pending before different benches. Today, the application has come up before me for the first time. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by IO/Inspector Vishal Choudhary.
3. Broadly speaking, the prosecution case is that the accused/applicant along with four others were running a company namely Star Global Star Limited and they induced 156 individuals to invest in the said company



2026:DHC:1969



involved in business of fisheries, floriculture and plantation of medicinal trees, assuring them high returns. The accused persons including the accused/applicant collected almost Rs. 13.4 Crores from innocent investors and after siphoning off the funds, all the accused persons fled away. Adopting the same *modus operandi*, the accused persons cheated various individuals, which led to registration of five more cases of similar nature across the country.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted by learned counsel that the accused/applicant is in jail for past four and a half years and trial will take a long time to conclude. It is also submitted by learned counsel that there is no evidence to show that the accused/applicant personally contacted any of the victims of the fraud or collected any money from anyone. Learned counsel for accused/applicant also contends that co-accused Rajesh Kumar Laura has already been granted bail by a coordinate bench on 07.11.2024, so the accused/applicant deserves the same relief by parity.

5. Learned APP for State strongly opposes the bail application, taking me through the record and contends that there can be no parity between Rajesh Kumar Laura and the present accused/applicant because against the present accused/applicant there is a charge of offence under Section 409 IPC, which was not against Rajesh Kumar Laura. It is further submitted by learned APP that the present accused/applicant was a Director as well as authorized signatory of the said company and for the criminal breach of trust, he has been charged for offence under Section 409 IPC which is



2026:DHC:1969



punishable with life imprisonment. It is also contended that one of the Directors of the accused/applicant has absconded and is not traceable till date.

6. In rebuttal, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that his name has been misused by the other accused persons insofar as he was not even aware about his having been made a Director in the company. It is submitted that the accused/applicant is a petty fruit vendor and is not aware as to where the collected amount of Rs. 13.4 Crores went.

7. As regards the claim of parity, the charge against accused Rajesh Kumar Laura is for offence under Section 420 IPC and not under Section 409 IPC, which charge is against the accused/applicant, being Director of the said company. Therefore, there is no question of any parity between the two. The offence under Section 409 IPC is punishable with life imprisonment. Admittedly, the accused/applicant has opted not to challenge framing of the charge for offence under Section 409 IPC.

8. *Prima facie*, it is not believable that a person would become Director of a company without his knowledge. According to the material on record, the present accused/applicant and co-accused Gajanand Kaushik held 50% shares each in the said company. The accused Gajanand Kaushik continues to be in jail. Rather, as mentioned above the accused/applicant feigns ignorance as to where the cheated amount was spent.

9. The present case is not a solitary case against the accused/applicant.



2026:DHC:1969



As mentioned above, five more cases of similar nature already stand registered against the accused/applicant across the country in different States. The Court cannot be oblivious to the agony of hundreds of those gullible investors, who entrusted their hard earned money, many of whom invested their lifelong savings and the accused persons took away the same.

10. As regards the delay in trial, the same is explained by the learned prosecutor on the ground that the order framing charge was challenged by the accused Rajesh Kumar Laura by way of revision petition and the matter remained pending there. The prosecution evidence commenced on 24.06.2025 and by now three witnesses of prosecution already stand examined as per the IO. Further, the delay was also caused because supplementary chargesheet against two accused persons who had absconded and were declared proclaimed persons was filed on 21.08.2023.

11. Considering the overall circumstances as discussed above, at this stage, I do not find any reason to grant bail to the accused/applicant. Therefore, this bail application is dismissed. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned jail superintendent for being conveyed to the accused/applicant forthwith.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

MARCH 10, 2026/dr