



2026:DHC:6096



\$~68

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

%

Date of Decision: 30.07.2026

+

BAIL APPLN. 2990/2026, CRL.M.A. 22569/2026 & CRL.M.A. 22570/2026**CHANDAN KUMAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Samridhi Dobhal, Mr. Himanshu,
Advocates

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with SI Neeraj Kumar**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 674/2025 of Police Station Subhash Place, Delhi for offence under Section 318(4)/316(2)/3(5)/61(2)/112 BNS.

2. Broadly speaking, allegation against the accused/applicant is that he is the tenant of the office space, which space was being misused by the co-accused persons by running a racket for college admissions. It is alleged that the co-accused persons collected money from a number of persons, which



2026:DHC:6096



was to the total tune of Rs. 57,00,000/- under the pretext of getting them admitted in a college in Mumbai, but no such admission was arranged and the co-accused persons even refused to return money.

3. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that there is no legally admissible evidence against the accused/applicant, so he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail. It is also submitted that even according to prosecution, not a single penny was received by the accused/applicant. It is further submitted that the co-accused Kumar Gaurav has already been granted regular bail. It is also submitted by learned counsel that the anticipatory bail application of the accused/applicant was dismissed by the Court of Sessions on 16.07.2026 but thereafter till date, the IO has not issued any notice to the accused/applicant to join investigation, which shows that the custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is not required. It is explained by learned counsel that since co-accused persons are friends of the present accused/applicant, he allowed them to use his office space for running property dealer office, but they misused the liberty granted to them.

4. Learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Neeraj Kumar accepts notice and fairly admits that apart from the disclosure statement of co-accused, there is no evidence against the present accused/applicant. However, the rent agreement of the office space has been collected by the IO. But as regards the contention that IO did not issue any notice to the accused/applicant to join investigation despite dismissal of anticipatory bail application by the Court of Sessions, no answer came from the IO except that now he shall



2026:DHC:6096



issue the notice.

5. In nutshell, as on date, the only evidence against the accused/applicant is that his office space was misused by his friends, the co-accused person. To add to it, as mentioned above, the IO also does not seem interested in any interrogation of the accused/applicant. Admittedly, not a single penny out of the allegedly cheated amount was received by the present accused/applicant.

6. Considering the overall circumstances as described above, I find no reason to deprive the accused/applicant liberty.

7. 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. 20,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO concerned.

8. It is also directed that as and when called in writing by the IO, the accused/applicant shall join investigation.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

JULY 30, 2026/as