Bail Application No. 1086/2026

FIR No. : 155/2025
PS: Pahar Ganj
State Vs. Satish Kumar

09.06.2026

Present: Sh. Himanshu Garg, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
None for the applicant/accused.

1. Arguments on the bail application were heard on 08.06.2026.

2. Ld. counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case, there is no material against the present applicant. It is submitted that the entire case of the prosecution rests on documentary evidence and the present applicant may be granted regular bail. It is submitted that charge sheet has already been filed. In support of his arguments written submissions has been placed on record.

3. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for the State duly assisted by the counsel for the complainant submits that allegations are serious in nature. The accused had defrauded the bank hereby causing loss to the general public. It is submitted that the present applicant does not deserves to be enlarged on bail.

4. I have heard Ld. Counsels for the parties and perused the record.

5. Brief facts of the case are that a complaint was received in PS Pahar Ganj made by Nikhil, Chandil wherein it was alleged that ICICI Bank has granted overdraft facility of Rs, 2,88,78,331/- in June 2022 and provided a collateral security i.e.

2nd floor of House no. H-123, Vikas Puti, New Delhi. The property was purchased on 23.03.2022 from Gulbir Singh. On internal checking the photographs of the seller in the latest sale deed were found to be different when compared with the photographs available on the 2nd last Sale Deed. Even the payments made through cheque of Kotak bank was found to be bogus and it appeared from the bank that fake property papers were submitted thereby inducing the ICICI Bank to disburse an OD Facility of the aforesaid amount.

6. During the course of investigation it was found that Sumit Kumar was running a proprietorship concern in the name of Rangriti Apparels. The analysis of the bank account further reveals that 96% of the limit was exhausted within 21 days.

7. The present applicant is a partner, who was inducted in the year 2020, the overdraft facility was granted in June 2022. The property documents which were given as collateral are of March, 2022, the entire transaction happened during the time when the present applicant was a partner in the firm. Sumit the other partner is yet to be arrested. The allegations are serious in nature. As per the charge sheet the prosecution has decided to invoke Section 111 BNS and they are in the process of obtaining certified copies of charge sheet and orders. The applicant was arrested at the airport. There are two other cases, both registered at EOW for offence punishable u/s 406/420/467/468/471/120 IPC. The allegations against the applicant are serious in nature.

8. It was argued that on account of pre trial detention the right to fair trial has been jeopardised and has relied upon the judgment of ***Navendu Babbar Vs. State 2020 SCC Online DEL***

2345. The said judgment is not applicable to the facts of the present case. In as much as in the said case the co-accused were granted bail in the year 2017 and the accused was arrested in an FIR dated 30.06.2015, on 22.02.2020 which is not so in the present case. The application stands dismissed.

9. Copy of the order be given dasti to the Ld. Counsel for the accused free of cost. Copy of the order be sent to the Jail Superintendent for information and necessary action. TCR be sent back.

(ANKUR JAIN-I)
ASJ-04/Central/Delhi.
09.06.2026

ANKUR JAIN Digitally signed by ANKUR JAIN Date: 2026.06.09 14:56:17 +0530

km