



2026:DHC:6108



\$~7

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

Date of decision: 28.07.2026

Uploaded on: 30.7.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2215/2026 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1157/2026**

HARSHDEEP SINGH CHANDHOK

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr.Anoop George Chaudhari, Sr.Adv.
with Mr.Shikhar Garg and Mr.Bhavya
Chhikara, Advs.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Avi Singh, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Shikhar Garg & Mr. Bhavya
Chhikara, Advs. for the complainant.
Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

Madhu Jain, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail in FIR No. 153/2026 registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden for offences punishable under Sections 308(6) and 351 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the "BNSS"). The prosecution case, in brief, is that the FIR came to be registered on the complaint of the father of one Ayush Arora alleging that the petitioner, along with other persons, had extorted money from the complainant's son by putting him under fear



and intimidation. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 24.04.2026 and was thereafter produced before the learned Jurisdictional Magistrate, who remanded him to police custody. The principal challenge raised in the present petition is not on the merits of the allegations but on the legality of the petitioner's arrest.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the arrest of the petitioner is illegal on the ground that the grounds of arrest were never supplied to him in the manner contemplated under law. It is submitted that the documents now placed on record by the Investigating Officer are manipulated and have been created subsequently. It is further argued that though the arrest memo records that the grounds of arrest were communicated to the petitioner's father on 24.04.2026, the WhatsApp communication relied upon by the prosecution was admittedly sent only on 25.04.2026, thereby rendering the arrest illegal.

4. *Per contra*, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the complainant, as well as learned APP for the State, submit that the aforesaid contention is without merit. It is submitted that the petitioner was produced before the learned Jurisdictional Magistrate immediately after his arrest, and the remand order dated 25.04.2026 specifically records that the petitioner had been arrested on 24.04.2026 at about 5:00 p.m. It is further recorded therein that the petitioner had spoken to his family members and friends after his arrest and that the learned Magistrate had informed him of the grounds of arrest. The petitioner also did not raise any grievance before the learned Magistrate regarding non-supply of the grounds of arrest. The said remand order has admittedly not been challenged and has attained finality.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions and perused the



material placed on record.

6. The record reveals that the document containing the grounds of arrest bears the signature of the petitioner, along with the date 24.04.2026 written in his own hand. Merely because the communication of the same document to the petitioner's father through WhatsApp was effected on the following day would not, by itself, lead to the conclusion that the grounds of arrest were not furnished to the petitioner at the time of his arrest. The endorsement regarding service upon a family member is an independent procedural requirement and the communication thereof may be effected subsequently or through any recognised mode, including electronic means.

7. Significantly, when the petitioner was produced before the learned Magistrate, no grievance regarding non-supply of the grounds of arrest was recorded. On the contrary, the remand proceedings record that the petitioner had interacted with his family members and friends after his arrest and that the statutory requirements attendant to the arrest had been complied with. The validity of the remand order has not been assailed by the petitioner and, therefore, the observations contained therein have attained finality and cannot be ignored while examining the present challenge.

8. The Supreme Court in ***Kasireddy Upender Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh & Ors.*** 2025 INSC 768, has reiterated that the requirement under Sections 47 and 48 of the BNSS is that the arrested person must be effectively informed of the grounds of arrest so as to have sufficient knowledge of the basic facts constituting the basis of such arrest. The Supreme Court further held that where the material on record demonstrates compliance with the constitutional and statutory safeguards, the arrest cannot be declared illegal merely on the basis of technical objections



2026:DHC:6108



regarding the mode or timing of communication to a family member.

9. In the facts of the present case, the contemporaneous record, including the grounds of arrest bearing the petitioner's signatures and the remand proceedings before the learned Magistrate, does not support the petitioner's contention that the grounds of arrest were not supplied to him. The subsequent forwarding of the same to the petitioner's father through WhatsApp on the following day, by itself, cannot invalidate an otherwise lawful arrest. This Court, therefore, finds no merit in the contention that the petitioner's arrest suffers from any constitutional or statutory infirmity.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

11. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

MADHU JAIN, J

JULY 28, 2026/JYH/P