$~1

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

% *Date of Decision: 23.09.2026*

\# **CNR No. DLHC010262052026**

\+ **BAIL APPLN. 2250/2026**

MRANAL SHARMA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Rai, Advocate (*through videoconferencing*)

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State with SI Dharmendra Sharma
Mr. Mudit Jain, Ms. Mahima Malhotra, Advocates for complainant *de facto*

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 513/2025 of PS Patel Nagar for offence under Section 318/316 BNS.

2. In furtherance of last order, I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant (*through videoconferencing*) and learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Dharmendra Sharma. I have also heard learned counsel for complainant *de facto*.

3. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is as follows. The complainant *de facto* came in contact with the accused/applicant through a WhatsApp group in which the complainant *de facto* had floated an inquiry on 01.04.2025 for selling his ticket for an upcoming concert in New Delhi because due to personal engagement, the complainant *de facto* was not in a position to attend the concert. Thereafter the complainant *de facto* and the accused/applicant started interacting with each other. The accused/applicant represented himself as belonging to an influential family engaged in iron and steel manufacturing business. The accused/applicant also claimed that he was working with one reputed law firm and asked the complainant *de facto* to check his profile on LinkedIn. The accused/applicant, after gaining confidence of the complainant *de facto* made the complainant *de facto* transfer money into the bank account of the accused/applicant under different pretexts. The accused/applicant also allegedly forged screenshots claiming that he had paid back some amount to the complainant *de facto*, though no such amount had been paid.

4. On last date, for detailed hearing adjournment was sought by learned APP for State, so the matter was adjourned to this day granting interim protection to the accused/applicant from arrest.

5. Today, learned counsel for accused/applicant commences his submissions stating that he has compromised the disputes with the complainant *de facto* and has already made part payment of Rs.1,00,000/- and they have agreed that the balance amount shall be paid within three

months. This is strongly denied by learned counsel for the complainant *de facto,* who states that the accused/applicant has been making false statement and no settlement has been done between them. Be that as it may, it is trite that the bail courts are not forum for recovery of money, so whether the accused/applicant has paid the cheated amount or not is irrelevant.

6. But more serious is the submission made by learned APP for State on instructions of the IO. It is submitted by learned APP for State that the accused/applicant had transmitted a picture of a cash deposit slip of bank reflecting that he had paid Rs.1,00,000/- to the complainant *de facto*. But since the complainant *de facto* had not received that amount, the IO carried out inquiry regarding the same from the concerned bank. Today, IO has shown me the written response of the bank stating that the said deposit slip is not a genuine document. As per bank, the stamp appearing on the deposit slip is a forged one. It is further submitted by the IO that despite the protection from arrest granted by this Court, the accused/applicant has not been handing over the original cash deposit slip for forensic analysis.

7. In response to a specific query, learned counsel for accused/applicant even today submits that he has no clear instructions as to whether the accused/applicant is willing to handover that original cash deposit slip.

8. At this stage of dictation, learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that the said deposit slip is of cheque and of not cash. But counsel for complainant *de facto* submits that even cheque has not been handed over

to him or deposited in his account. Rather, the printout of the picture of the said deposit slip shown to me clearly shows that it was a cash deposit slip. It is insisted by learned counsel for accused/applicant (*who appears through videoconferencing*) that the said deposit slip even bears cheque number. But even this submission is wrong in the sense that no cheque number has been mentioned in that deposit slip.

9. In these circumstances, the requirement expressed by the IO for custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant does not appear to be unjustified.

10. Considering the overall circumstances described above, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail. Therefore, the anticipatory bail application and the accompanying application are dismissed.

GIRISH KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, 2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4afec45569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,CID - 7047638, postalCode=110003, st=Delhi, serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d15570996b40f80cbd2eee60402c487965ff801e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2026.09.23 16:52:02 +05'30'

GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)

SEPTEMBER 23, 2026/*as*

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:RAHUL YADAV
Signing Date:23.09.2026
16:55:27