



2026:DHC:1305



\$~5

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

%

Date of Decision: 16.02.2026+ **BAIL APPLN. 4496/2024**

ASLAM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohammad Faraz, Advocate
(*through videoconferencing*).

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
(*through videoconferencing*) with SI
Heera Lal, PS Wazirabad.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 614/2024 of PS Wazirabad for offence under Section 420/468/471 IPC.
2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Heera Lal.
3. Broadly speaking, prosecution case flowing out of the FIR is that the accused/applicant, being tenant in the subject property obtained transfer of electricity connection in his name on the basis of forged documents of transfer of that property. The property was originally owned by one Shajika Babu, in whose name the electricity connection was installed. Shajika Babu



sold the property to Yatindra Nirvik, but retained the electricity connection in her name. Yatindra Nirvik executed agreement to sell with Naresh Kumar. The accused/applicant continued to remain as tenant in the property. It is Naresh Kumar, on whose complaint the FIR was registered.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that now parties have compromised the disputes and Yatindra Nirvik has now executed sale deed of the property in favour of the accused/applicant. Further, learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that the alleged forged documents were not created by the accused/applicant. It is contended that the accused/applicant does not know English and signs all his documents in Urdu.

5. Learned APP submits, and rightly so that settlement between the private parties does not absolve the accused of liability for obtaining transfer of electricity connection on forged documents. However, on instructions of IO, it is submitted by learned prosecutor that they have no document bearing English signatures of the accused/applicant.

6. It is not in question that TPDDL received a transfer connection request based on forged documents. The question is as to whether it is the accused/applicant, being tenant who tried to play fraud with TPDDL or it is someone else, who tried to get the accused/applicant falsely involved.

7. In response to a specific query, the IO submits that the present accused/applicant is connected with the alleged offence because it is from



2026:DHC:1305



his mobile phone that electricity connection transfer request was generated and that followed a one-time password (OTP) on the mobile phone of the accused/applicant.

8. The IO submits that neither any technical logs from TPDDL reflecting receipt of request from mobile phone of the accused/applicant nor any generation of OTP has been collected during investigation, nor any document bearing English signatures of the accused/applicant has been found.

9. In these circumstances, I find no reason to deprive the accused/applicant liberty.

10. The application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of his arrest, the accused/applicant shall be released on bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO concerned. The accused/applicant shall join investigation as and when directed in writing by the IO.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

FEBRUARY 16, 2026/dr