



\$~5 & 6

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 17.02.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1725/2025 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 972/2025**

PAWAN KUMAR MISHRAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ronak Gupta, Ms. Nazia Parveen,
Mr. Navjot Singh and Mr. Kunwar
Samrat Solanki Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with IO/ASI Raj Kumar.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1782/2025 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1016/2025**

UDIT MISHRAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ronak Gupta, Ms. Nazia Parveen,
Mr. Navjot Singh and Mr. Kunwar
Samrat Solanki Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with IO/ASI Raj Kumar.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicants seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 171/2025 of PS I.P. Estate for offence under Section 420/467/468/471/34



IPC. The accused/applicant Pawan Kumar Mishra is father of the accused/applicant Udit Mishra.

2. These anticipatory bail applications, listed before me for the first time, are pending since May 2025 and are part of 179 old pending bail applications assigned to this bench by way of transfer from different benches. Despite that, none appears for accused/applicants. That is apparently because both accused/applicants were granted interim protection from arrest by the predecessor bench. Having been granted interim protection on date to date basis, the accused/applicants have taken an impression that they can get the matter adjourned endlessly.

2.1 At this stage during dictation, the arguing counsel Mr. Ronak Gupta, Advocate has appeared and I have heard him as well as learned prosecutor.

3. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is that being a tenant in the premises, the accused/applicant Pawan Kumar Mishra forged an electricity bill to obtain water connection in his name in the said tenanted premises.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for accused/applicants that there is a dispute between the present accused/applicants and their landlord, who tried to forcibly evict them from the tenanted property so on their complaint FIR No.175/2023 was registered by the local police on 20.06.2023. It is as a



matter of counter-blast, according to learned counsel, that the landlord connived with the local police and got registered the current FIR. Further, it is submitted by learned counsel that the alleged forgery of the electricity bill took place in the year 2023 but the incident was reported for the first time by the landlord on 03.04.2025. It is also contended that multiple civil litigations between the accused/applicants and landlord as well as between the accused/applicants and Delhi Jal Board were instituted.

5. Learned APP for State assisted IO/ASI Raj Kumar submits that during the period of their interim protection the accused/applicants regularly joined the investigation, but did not hand over original forged bill of electricity.

6. As regards handing over the original electricity bill, it is contended by learned counsel for accused/applicants that the same is not in possession of the accused/applicants because they never forged the same. It is also pointed out by learned counsel that even according to the investigation, copy of the allegedly forged bill was not endorsed by either of the accused/applicants to be the true copy of the original document.

7. Considering the above circumstances, especially the submission of prosecution side that the accused/applicants have joined investigation, as and when directed by the IO and have not misused their liberty, I find no reason to deprive liberty to the accused/applicants.



2026:DHC:1365



8. Therefore, both these applications are allowed and it is directed that in the event of their arrest, the accused/applicants shall be released on bail, subject to their furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- each with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO concerned.

GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)

FEBRUARY 17, 2026/ry