

Bail application No. 1616/2025
FIR No. 128/2018
PS: DBG Road
State of Delhi vs Vimal Manchanda

03.08.2026

This is an application u/s 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of applicant/accused Vimal Manchanda.

Present : Sh. Ashish Kajal, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for State.
Ms. Shalu, Ld. Counsel for applicant / accused through VC.

Matter is listed for orders.

COMMON ORDER

1. By this common order, this Court shall decide two cross-applications arising out of FIR No. 128/2018, PS DBG Road, which, in terms of the order dated 23.09.2025, have been heard together as they pertain to the same subject matter: (i) **M. CrI. No. 940/2024 (filed on 20.12.2024)**, an application moved by the SHO/IO, PS DBG Road (forwarded through the Ld. Addl. PP), under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. (corresponding to Section 483(3) BNSS, 2023), seeking cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to accused Vimal Manchanda vide order dated 19.06.2023 passed by the Ld. ADJ-04 (Vacation Judge), Central, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, and, in substance, seeking committal of the accused to custody upon addition of graver offences; and (ii) **Bail Application No. 1616/2025 (filed on 01.09.2025)**, moved by the accused Vimal Manchanda under Section 482 BNSS, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in respect of Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, added by the Investigating Officer during further investigation on 17.10.2024.

2. Arguments on both applications were heard at length on 27.07.2026, by Ld. Addl. PP for the State duly assisted by the SHO/IO concerned, Ld. Counsel for the complainant and Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused. This Court has perused the entire record.

FACTUAL MATRIX

3. FIR No. 128/2018 was registered at PS DBG Road on 01.05.2018 under Sections 420/34 IPC on the complaint of Sh. Ashish Gupta (stated to be a close friend of Sh. Mahesh Gupta and of his late father Sh. Pyare Lal Gupta). The gravamen of the allegations is that accused Vimal Manchanda, introduced by his father/co-accused Vijay Manchanda, induced the complainant and Mahesh Gupta in the year 2014-2015 to purchase agricultural land admeasuring 3.6940 hectares comprised in Khasra Nos. 499, 566, 501 (Khata No. 0336) and Khasra No. 646 (Khata No. 0327), Village Suthiana, Pargana Dadri, Tehsil Sadar, Gautam Budh Nagar, U.P. ('the subject property'), representing that the land was likely to be acquired by the Government and would fetch handsome compensation. The accused claimed title as holder of a General Power of Attorney and Will, both dated 26.08.2015, executed by co-accused Amardeep Singh, whose name was mutated in the revenue records on 11.05.2015. An Agreement to Sell dated 18.09.2015 and a registered Sale Deed dated 09.11.2015 were executed in favour of Sh. Pyare Lal Gupta for a consideration of Rs. 1,11,00,000/-, paid through banking channels, besides stamp duty of Rs. 25,70,500/-; a further sum of Rs. 1,00,00,000/- is alleged to have been paid against a promissory note co-signed by accused Vimal Manchanda and Vijay Manchanda.

4. It is alleged that the purchasers subsequently learnt, upon receipt of a notice from the Civil Court, Gautam Budh Nagar, that the subject property had been sold by Smt. Gursharan Kaur (mother of co-accused Amardeep Singh) as far back as on 30.07.1996 to Ramrikh, Ramji Lal and Ramu, who in turn sold it to Mahesh Chandra @ Mahesh Bhati & Ors. in the year 1999 by registered sale deeds dated 23.09.1999 and 11.01.2000; that the mutation in favour of Amardeep Singh dated 11.05.2015 was obtained ex parte; that a status quo/restraint order dated 09.11.2015 had been passed by the Settlement Officer (Consolidation), Surajpur, and the sale deed in favour of Pyare Lal Gupta was nonetheless executed; and that the said mutation was restored in

favour of Mahesh Chandra & Ors. vide order dated 29.02.2016. It is further alleged that after registration of the FIR, a Settlement Agreement dated 01.09.2018 was executed whereby the accused agreed to pay Rs. 4.5 crores to Pyare Lal Gupta, and a settlement was also recorded before the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, on 05.11.2019; however, the cheques issued thereunder were dishonoured, and proceedings under Section 138 NI Act are stated to be pending.

5. The accused Vimal Manchanda was granted anticipatory bail by the Ld. ADJ-04 (Vacation Judge) vide order dated 19.06.2023 in Bail Application No. 1042/2023. The petitions of Sh. Mahesh Gupta (CRL.M.C. 8748/2023 and CRL.M.C. 1461/2024) seeking cancellation of the said anticipatory bail were dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide common order dated 03.05.2024, with the sole modification that the accused shall take prior permission of the concerned Trial Court before travelling abroad. By a separate order of even date, co-accused Amardeep Singh was also admitted to anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in BAIL APPLN. 3532/2023. The Hon'ble High Court, inter alia, observed that the dispute relates to the sale transaction of the year 2015, that the FIR came to be registered only in 2018, and that the case is based upon documentary evidence.

6. During further investigation, on 17.10.2024, after obtaining legal opinion, the IO added Sections 465/467/468/471/120B IPC broadly on two counts: first, that the online mutation and physical possession of the subject property is stated to be with Mahesh Bhati since 1999 and not with the accused persons, and an order dated 27.07.2024 had been passed by the Up-Sanchalak/Consolidation authority, Gautam Budh Nagar in favour of Mahesh Chand & Ors.; and secondly, that during verification of cheque no. 115049, Bank of India, allegedly issued by accused Vimal Manchanda to co-accused Amardeep Singh towards consideration of Rs. 18,00,000/- for the GPA and Will dated 26.08.2015, the account was found to be in the name of M/s NMK Textile Mills India Pvt. Ltd.; the said company disclaimed the cheque and

lodged a complaint of misuse of its cheque, and its authorised signatory Sandeep Kumar (stated to be an employee of the accused) denied having signed it. Co-accused Amardeep Singh is stated to have disclosed that the cheque given to him was dishonoured as the account stood closed since 2011. The IO accordingly moved the present application seeking cancellation of bail, asserting that custodial interrogation of the accused is required for determination of the authorship of the allegedly forged documents. Pertinently, despite the FIR being of the year 2018, no charge-sheet has been filed till date, a circumstance adversely commented upon by the predecessor of this Court in its order dated 15.07.2025.

7. The accused, on his part, has placed on record orders dated 11.07.2025/11.08.2025 of the Deputy Director (Consolidation), Gautam Budh Nagar, whereby the ex parte order dated 27.07.2024 (relied upon by the IO as the 'new circumstance') has been set aside/cancelled, the orders dated 11.05.2015 and 18.09.2019 recording Amardeep Singh as the titleholder have been noticed, and the matter has been restored for adjudication. The title dispute thus remains sub judice before the consolidation authorities. The accused has also moved CRL.M.C. 2214/2026 before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi seeking quashing of the FIR; vide order dated 25.03.2026, notice has been issued therein and status report called; the matter is re-notified for 07.08.2026. Admittedly, no stay of investigation or of these proceedings has been granted therein, and hence there is no impediment in deciding the present applications.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE STATE AND THE COMPLAINANT

8. Ld. Addl. PP for the State, relying upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'X' v. *State of Maharashtra* (decided on 17.03.2023), 2023 SCC Online SC 279 and *Pradeep Ram v. State of Jharkhand*, (2019) 17 SCC 326, submitted that the present application is maintainable before this Court inasmuch as it is the Court which granted bail alone which can consider the

question of committing the accused to custody upon addition of graver offences. It was emphasised that with the addition of Section 467 IPC, the punishment now prescribed extends to imprisonment for life, and that custody of the accused is required for the purposes of investigation, particularly for determining the authorship of the forged documents.

9. Ld. Counsel for the complainant supplemented the State's submissions by contending that: (i) the accused persons were never the owners of the subject property; they manipulated the revenue record and deceived the complainant's side; (ii) the property stood sold by the mother of co-accused Amardeep Singh way back in 1996, and thereafter came to the share of Mahesh Bhati through Ramji Lal and others in 1999, in which transactions Amardeep Singh himself is stated to have been a witness; (iii) in 2017 the property never stood in the name of Amardeep Singh and the mutation stood in the name of Mahesh Bhati; (iv) despite a restraint/status quo order operating in respect of the subject property, the accused went ahead and executed the sale papers; (v) the accused has not produced before the IO any document establishing his ownership; the title papers and possession are with Mahesh Bhati; and (vi) the accused Vimal Manchanda holds residency of Canada, his wife and children reside there, and he is a flight risk.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE ACCUSED

10. Per contra, Ld. Counsel for the accused submitted that: (i) the transaction is of the year 2015 and Pyare Lal Gupta, the purchaser, was the father of Mahesh Gupta; the mutation of the subject property stood in the name of Amardeep Singh as on 11.05.2015, and the GPA/Will in favour of the accused were executed on 26.08.2015, i.e., the accused acted on the revenue record as it then stood; (ii) the complainant's side never applied for mutation in their favour for the last about nine years, and their versions keep changing because the Government is in the process of acquiring the property; (iii) the mutation order dated 27.07.2024, the solitary 'new circumstance' cited

by the IO, has since been set aside by the Deputy Director (Consolidation) vide orders dated 11.07.2025/11.08.2025, and the orders dated 11.05.2015 and 18.09.2019 upholding Amardeep Singh's entry hold the field; the title dispute is sub judice before the competent revenue forum; (iv) both the Hon'ble High Court and the Sessions Court have in the past characterised the dispute as essentially civil and document-based; (v) despite eight years having elapsed since registration of the FIR, no charge-sheet has been filed, and the laxity of the investigating agency cannot be a ground to curtail the liberty of the accused; (vi) there is no allegation of breach of any condition of bail, tampering with evidence or influencing of witnesses since 19.06.2023; (vii) an FIR (No. 0158/2023, PS Kotwali, Jaipur, u/s 420/467/468/471/120-B/384/506 IPC) stands registered in Rajasthan wherein Sh. Mahesh Gupta figures as an accused and is stated to be absconding, which reflects upon the bona fides of the complainant's side; and (viii) a petition seeking quashing of the present FIR is pending before the Hon'ble High Court.

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION

11. The following points arise for determination:

(A) *Whether this Court can cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the accused vide order dated 19.06.2023, which stands affirmed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 03.05.2024;*

(B) *Whether, upon addition of Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, the accused is liable to be committed to custody in exercise of the jurisdiction recognised in Pradeep Ram v. State of Jharkhand and 'X' v. State of Maharashtra; and*

(C) *Whether the accused is entitled to anticipatory bail in respect of the newly added offences.*

THE LEGAL POSITION

12. The legal position emerging from the authorities cited at the Bar may

be summarised thus. In *Pradeep Ram v. State of Jharkhand*, (2019) 17 SCC 326, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that where, after grant of bail, further cognizable and non-bailable offences are added, the accused can surrender and apply for bail for the newly added offences; and that the Court which granted bail, in exercise of powers under Section 437(5) or Section 439(2) Cr.P.C., can direct that the person be arrested and committed to custody on account of the addition of graver and non-bailable offences, which need not always be accompanied by an order of cancellation of the earlier bail. The investigating agency, upon such addition, cannot arrest the accused of its own accord but must obtain an order from the Court which granted the bail. The judgment in '*X*' v. *State of Maharashtra* (17.03.2023) 2023 SCCOnline SC 279, relied upon by the Ld. Addl. PP, reiterates these principles.

13. Two consequences follow, and both must be kept in view. First, the protection granted to the accused on 19.06.2023, and affirmed on 03.05.2024, enures only in respect of the offences then invoked, i.e., Sections 420/34 IPC; it does not automatically extend to the offences added on 17.10.2024. The accused has, correctly, and in consonance with the very procedure indicated in *Pradeep Ram*, approached this Court by way of Bail Application No. 1616/2025 seeking anticipatory bail qua the added offences. Secondly, the power recognised in *Pradeep Ram* to commit an accused to custody upon addition of graver offences is discretionary ('can direct'), not mandatory; its exercise must be governed by the facts of each case, including whether custody is genuinely required for the investigation of the added offences.

14. As regards cancellation simpliciter, the law is equally settled. In *Gurcharan Singh v. State (Delhi Administration)*, (1978) 1 SCC 118, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that where the State is aggrieved by an order of bail and no new circumstances have cropped up, it is futile to move the Sessions Judge again, and the appropriate course is to move the High Court; and considerations of judicial propriety forbid a subordinate Court from sitting in appeal over an order affirmed by the superior Court. In *Dolat Ram*

v. State of Haryana, (1995) 1 SCC 349, it was held that rejection of bail and cancellation of bail already granted stand on different footings: the latter requires supervening circumstances, such as interference or attempt to interfere with the due course of administration of justice, evasion of justice, or misuse of the concession. In *Puran v. Rambilas*, (2001) 6 SCC 338, and again in the line of authority culminating in '*X*' *v. State of Telangana* (2018) 16 SCC 511 relied upon by the accused, it has been held that the mere addition of sections does not, by itself, constitute a ground for cancellation of bail unless it is shown that the newly added offences materially alter the complexion of the case and that custody is necessitated.

15. Finally, the Constitution Bench in *Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, has clarified that anticipatory bail, once granted, ordinarily enures without limitation of time, but is always capable of being varied or cancelled under Sections 437(5)/439(2) Cr.P.C. upon supervening circumstances, including where graver offences surface. The touchstone for anticipatory bail remains the parameters restated therein and in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra*, (2011) 1 SCC 694: the nature and gravity of the accusation, the role of the accused, antecedents, possibility of fleeing from justice, likelihood of repetition, whether the accusation is made with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant, the requirement of custodial interrogation, and the balance between a free, fair and full investigation on the one hand and prevention of harassment and unjustified detention on the other. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI*, (2022) 10 SCC 51, and *Siddharth v. State of U.P.* 2021 SCCOnline SC 615 has reiterated that arrest is not to be mechanical, particularly in cases resting on documentary evidence.

ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

(A) Whether this Court can cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the accused vide order dated 19.06.2023, which stands affirmed by

the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 03.05.2024;

16. Insofar as the prayer in M. Crl. No. 940/2024 seeks cancellation of the anticipatory bail order dated 19.06.2023 in respect of Sections 420/34 IPC, the same cannot be countenanced. The complainant's own petitions seeking cancellation of that very order were dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 03.05.2024 after noticing, in terms, the allegations of forgery of documents, the dishonour of the settlement cheques, the rival revenue orders including the order dated 18.09.2019, and the plea of flight risk premised on the accused's Canadian residency. Each of the grounds now urged in support of cancellation, save the addition of sections and the order dated 27.07.2024, was thus available to, and considered by, the Hon'ble High Court. As held in *Gurcharan Singh (supra)*, and as recorded by this Court in its order dated 02.05.2025, this Court, being subordinate in the judicial hierarchy, cannot interfere with, or whittle down, an order affirmed by the Hon'ble High Court, except upon supervening circumstances demonstrating misuse of the concession of bail. No such supervening misuse is even alleged: it is nobody's case that the accused has, after 19.06.2023 or after 03.05.2024, breached any condition of bail, failed to join investigation when called, tampered with evidence, influenced any witness, or left the country without permission. The prayer for cancellation of the bail dated 19.06.2023 qua Sections 420/34 IPC is, therefore, declined. If the State is aggrieved by the order dated 03.05.2024, its remedy lies before the superior Courts.

(B) Whether, upon addition of Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, the accused is liable to be committed to custody in exercise of the jurisdiction recognised in *Pradeep Ram v. State of Jharkhand and 'X' v. State of Maharashtra*; and

17. The real question is whether the addition of Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, Section 467 whereof is punishable with imprisonment for life, warrants a direction committing the accused to custody in terms of *Pradeep Ram (supra)*. The maintainability of such a prayer before

this Court, being the Court which granted the bail, is not in doubt; the objection of the accused founded on *Gurcharan Singh (supra)* does not answer the distinct Pradeep Ram jurisdiction, which operates qua the added offences and does not entail interference with the order dated 03.05.2024, which was confined to Sections 420/34 IPC. To that limited extent, the submission of the Ld. Addl. PP on maintainability is accepted.

18. However, on a careful conspectus of the record, this Court is not persuaded that the discretion to commit the accused to custody ought to be exercised, for the following reasons:

(i) The added offences arise out of the self-same transaction of 2015 which forms the subject matter of the original FIR. The allegation of forgery of revenue entries and of the title documents was contained in the complaint itself (which invoked Sections 467/468/471 IPC as far back as 2017-18) and was expressly noticed by the Hon'ble High Court in its order dated 03.05.2024. As observed by this Court in its order dated 02.05.2025, the documents relating to the allegations of forgery were available with the IO, and were discussed before the Hon'ble High Court, when the anticipatory bail was affirmed. The formal addition of sections on 17.10.2024, upon legal opinion, does not, in these circumstances, so materially alter the complexion of the case as to necessitate custody.

(ii) The first foundation of the added sections, namely the mutation order dated 27.07.2024 in favour of Mahesh Chand & Ors., has ceased to hold the field: the Deputy Director (Consolidation), Gautam Budh Nagar, by orders dated 11.07.2025/11.08.2025 placed on record and supplied to the IO (order dated 02.09.2025 of this Court refers), has set aside the said ex parte order and restored the proceedings, while noticing the orders dated 11.05.2015 and 18.09.2019 recording Amardeep Singh as the title-holder. The title to

the subject property is, therefore, squarely and presently sub judice before the competent consolidation authorities, whose orders have oscillated between the two sides. Which of the rival chains of title, that of Gursharan Kaur–Ramrikh/Ramji Lal/Ramu-Mahesh Bhati, or that of the mutation of 11.05.2015 in favour of Amardeep Singh, must prevail, is quintessentially a question for the revenue/civil forum, and the criminal Court, at the stage of bail, cannot record even a prima facie conclusive finding thereon. Custody of the accused can contribute nothing to the resolution of that question.

(iii) The second foundation, the NMK Textile Mills cheque no. 115049, is a matter of documentary and expert verification: the bank account records have been obtained, the authorised signatory has been examined, and the company's complaint is on record. The stated purpose of custodial interrogation, 'determination of the authorship of forged documents', is achieved through specimen signatures/handwriting and comparison by the forensic science laboratory, for which Section 349 BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 311A Cr.P.C.) provides a complete and less invasive mechanism. It is settled that custodial interrogation is not to be granted for the mere asking, and no material has been shown as to what recovery or disclosure is expected from the accused which cannot otherwise be obtained, particularly when the IO has himself seized the original documents (as recorded in the order dated 19.06.2023).

(iv) The conduct of the investigation itself militates against the plea of urgency of custody. The complaint is of 18.07.2017; the FIR is of 01.05.2018; the accused has been on anticipatory bail since 19.06.2023 and has admittedly joined the investigation; yet, in over eight years, no charge-sheet has been filed, a fact adversely noted by this Court on 15.07.2025. An investigating agency which has not brought its investigation to a conclusion in eight years, without

custody, cannot ordinarily be heard to say, absent fresh and compelling material, that the investigation will fail unless the accused is now committed to custody.

(v) There is no allegation, much less material, of misuse of liberty, of tampering, of threat to witnesses, or of evasion. The apprehension of flight founded on the accused's Canadian residency stands addressed by the condition imposed by the Hon'ble High Court on 03.05.2024, requiring prior permission of the Trial Court for foreign travel, which condition continues to bind the accused and is being reinforced hereinafter.

19. The reliance of the accused on the Rajasthan FIR No. 0158/2023, PS Kotwali, Jaipur, in which Sh. Mahesh Gupta is arrayed as an accused, and on the pendency of the quashing petition before the Hon'ble High Court, has been noted; however, neither circumstance is determinative of the present applications, and no opinion is expressed thereon. Equally, the grievances of the complainant regarding the genuineness of the accused's title, the execution of the sale deed in the teeth of the restraint order dated 09.11.2015, and the dishonour of the settlement cheques, are matters going to the merits of the trial and of the pending Section 138 NI Act proceedings, on which, likewise, nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion.

(C) Whether the accused is entitled to anticipatory bail in respect of the newly added offences.

20. Applying the parameters of *Sushila Aggarwal and Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre (supra)* to the added offences: (a) the accusations, though grave in the abstract by reason of Section 467 IPC, rest on the same documentary substratum already judicially considered twice over; (b) the accused has clean antecedents, as recorded in the order dated 19.06.2023, and nothing to the contrary has been shown; (c) he has deep roots in society and remains subject to the travel restriction imposed by the Hon'ble High Court;

(d) he has joined and undertakes to continue joining the investigation; (e) the necessity of custodial interrogation has not been made out, as discussed above; and (f) the investigation being documentary, no prejudice would be caused to a free, fair and full investigation by extending protection, subject to stringent conditions, whereas arrest at this distance of time, in an investigation pending for eight years without charge-sheet, would amount to unjustified deprivation of liberty. The principle that 'bail is the rule and jail the exception', reiterated in *Satender Kumar Antil (supra)*, applies with added force.

ORDER

21. In view of the foregoing discussion:

(A) M. Crl. No. 940/2024 is dismissed. The prayer for cancellation of the anticipatory bail dated 19.06.2023 (affirmed by the Hon'ble High Court on 03.05.2024) is declined; and, in exercise of the discretion recognised in *Pradeep Ram v. State of Jharkhand (supra)*, this Court declines to direct that the accused be arrested or committed to custody merely on account of the addition of Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC.

(B) Bail Application No. 1616/2025 is allowed. It is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant/accused Vimal Manchanda in FIR No. 128/2018, PS DBG Road, in respect of the offences under Sections 465/467/468/471/120-B IPC added during further investigation, he shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh) with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned IO/SHO/Ld. MM/Link MM/Duty MM, subject to the following conditions:

(i) the applicant shall join the investigation as and when called by the IO, and shall cooperate fully and truthfully therein;

(ii) the applicant shall, as and when lawfully required, furnish his specimen signatures, handwriting and such documents as may be directed in accordance with law, including under Section 349 BNSS, 2023;

(iii) the applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact, threaten or influence the complainant, Sh. Mahesh Gupta, Sh. Mahesh Bhati/Mahesh Chandra, the witnesses of M/s NMK Textile Mills India Pvt. Ltd., or any other prosecution witness, nor tamper with the evidence in any manner;

(iv) the applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Trial Court, in terms of the order dated 03.05.2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, which condition shall continue to operate;

(v) the applicant shall furnish his mobile number to the IO, keep it operational and switched on at all times, and shall intimate the IO and the Court of any change in his residential address or contact details; and

(vi) in the event of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of this bail.

22. It is clarified that the observations made hereinabove are confined to the disposal of the present applications, are prima facie in nature, and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, nor shall they influence the investigation, the proceedings pending before the consolidation/revenue authorities, or the trial.

23. The IO is directed to conclude the investigation and file the final report in accordance with law with due expedition, keeping in view the observations of this Court in the order dated 15.07.2025 regarding the

inordinate delay.

24. Both the applications stand disposed of accordingly. Copy of this order be given dasti to both sides, be sent to the IO/SHO, PS DBG Road, for information and compliance, and be uploaded on the website of the District Courts forthwith. The Ahlmad is directed to place a copy of this order in each of the two files.

(SHREYA ARORA MEHTA)
JUDGE BAIL ROSTER
ASJ/SFTC-02(CENTRAL)
THC: DELHI : 03.08.2026