

**Bail Application : 1079/2026, 1070/2026 and 1083
FIR No. : 132/2026
State Vs. Manmeet Singh son of Narinder Sahi
Vinayak Gupta son of Raj Kumar
and Gagandeep Singh son of Jasbir Singh
PS : Crime Branch**

01.06.2026

VC of the court is not working.

Present: Sh. Himanshu Garg, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Mohit Choudhary, Balwinder Singh Suri and
Nishant Walia, Ld. Counsels for the applicant
Manmeet Singh.
Sh. Mohd. Nadeen Khan, Ld. Counsel for applicant
Vinayak Gupta.
Sh. Vipin Kumar, Ld. Counsel for applicant
Gagandeep Singh.
ASI Vinay Tyagi, PS Crime Branch.

Reply on behalf of IO filed. Copy supplied.

Arguments on the application heard.

Put up for orders.

(ANKUR JAIN-I)
ASJ-04/Central/Delhi.
01.06.2026

ORDER:-

1. By this common order I shall decide three bail applications of the applicants Manmeet Singh, Gagandeep Singh and Vinayak Gupta seeking regular bail.
2. Ld. counsel for the applicant/accused Manmeet has argued that in a very clandestine manner raid has been carried out by the police officials. It is submitted that from the present applicant

:2:

only 90 pirated MRF tubes have been shown to have recovered. It is submitted that Section 63 of the Copyright has no application. Section 318 (4) BNS which is akin to Section 420 IPC is not made out. It is submitted that in any case the punishment provided is three years under Section 63 of the Copyright Act and less than seven years under Section 318(4) BNS. It is submitted that grounds of arrest have not been supplied and thus the arrest being illegal accused is entitled to regular bail.

3. Ld. counsel for applicant/accused Vinayak Gupta has submitted that accused is in JC since 17.05.2026, recovery if any, already stands effected no ingredients of the offence is made out. The applicant is not the manufacturer and as such he is entitled to be granted on regular bail.

4. Ld. counsel for applicant/accused Gagandeep has address arguments on similar lines. In addition he has submitted that accused are not named in the FIR and has been arrested subsequent to the disclosure statement of co-accused Mohd. Zakir. It is thus submitted that applicant may be granted regular bail.

5. On the other hand, Ld. Addl. PP for the State submits that none of the applicant is entitled to bail, the investigation is at the initial stage. The offence is grave and serious as well as organized and structured in nature. It is submitted that grounds of arrest were duly supplied to the applicant Manmeet, as well as to the other applicants/accused persons. It is submitted that no ground is made out to grant bail to the applicants/accused.

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

7. The brief facts of the case are that on 16.05.2026 information was received that shop keeper having shop at SPM Marg were selling pirated tubes of MRF and CEAT Company. On this information a raiding party was constituted and raid was carried out at first floor, Friends Tyre Market, SP Mukherjee Marg from where accused Mohd. Zakir was arrested while packing pirated tubes of MRF. The godown was owned by applicant/accused Gagandeep. Subsequently from the said place packing material, machine were recovered. Thereafter raid was carried out at the godown of Deepak Gupta and in his presence pirated tubes and pouches were recovered. Similarly, from the shops of Manmeet, Dinesh and Vinayak Gupta recoveries were effected. The representative of MRF Company who were present also stated that these tubes which were recovered are of inferior quality and MRF has stopped using poly pouches in packing since 2022.

8. The first argument on behalf of the counsel for the applicant that no ground of arrest was served upon the accused Manmeet Singh. The perusal of the police file shows that grounds of arrest were served upon the applicant which were duly received by the brother Saranjeet Singh to whom information of arrest was given, as per the arrest memo. The grounds of arrest have been recovered from the personal search memo of the applicant Manmeet, therefore, to argue that arrest is

illegal for non supply of ground of arrest is preposterous and liable to be rejected.

9. It was next contended by the counsel for the applicant Manmeet as well as for the counsel for the applicant Vinayak Gupta that no offence under Copyright Act or cheating is made out.

10. It has to be kept in mind that at the stage of grant of bail the court need not carry out the thread bear analysis of the ingredients of the offence. The recovery of tubes bears the stamp/logo of MRF. Therefore, to say that copyright act has not been infringed, at this stage is difficult to fathom. In the present case the recovery of fake low quality rubber tubes would cause danger to the small consumers who purchase the same believing to be genuine. They are not only causes danger to the public at large but is also causing loss to the ex-chequer. They are making consumer's believe that the articles which he is purchasing is a genuine product. They are inducing them to buy a product which is not genuine. The sub standard tyre tube which are essentially used in motor cycles could easily burst thereby causing serious risk of road accident, endangering human life. The allegations if taken at their face value indicates a systematic activity of manufacturing, packaging and distribution in a retail shop.

11. The investigation is at initial stage. The accused persons for their own profit with dishonest intention are manufacturing and selling goods i.e. rubber tubes which has the potential of endangering public safety.

12. It was argued that recoveries have been made in the dead of night. The argument is noted to be rejected. The police cannot be blamed for acting swiftly.

13. At this stage no ground is made out to enlarge the applicants on bail. Applications seeking regular bail stands dismissed. 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.

(ANKUR JAIN-I)
ASJ-04/Central/Delhi.
01.06.2026