IN THE COURT OF SH. AMIT KUMAR,
SPECIAL JUDGE, PC ACT (CBI) - 04, ROUSE AVENUE COURTS, DELHI

CNR No. DLCT11-000050-2023

CT No. 01/2023

ED Vs. M/s SSK Trading Private Limited & Ors.

31.03.2023

Present : Sh. Arun Khatri, Ld. SPP for ED through VC.
Sh. Siddharth Singh, Ld. Counsel for ED.
Sh. Adit S. Pujari, Ld. Counsel for applicant/A2 Surender Kumar Bansal through VC.
Ms. Aparajita Sinha and Sh. Priyansh Jain, Ld. Counsels for applicant/A2 Surender Kumar Bansal.
Accused Surender Kumar Bansal not produced from JC.

O R D E R

1. Vide this order, I will dispose off the two bail applications of the applicant/A2 Surender Kumar Bansal seeking bail on merits and the other seeking default bail.

2. The brief facts necessary for disposal of these applications are that the present complaint was filed by the ED against SSK Trading Pvt. Ltd. and 27 other accused on 13/01/2023. The applicant was arrested on 15/11/2022. As per allegations made in the complaint, CBI registered an FIR no. RC-BD1/2018/E/0006 CBI/BS & FC, New Delhi dated 12.04.2018 under Section 420/467/471/468/120B of IPC and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1) (d) of the PC Act against SSK Trading Pvt. Ltd. (here in after referred as SSK) and its Directors including

applicant on the basis of written complaint dated 19.12.2017 and addendum dated 25.01.2018 lodged by PNB, who was the leader of the consortium banks who granted loans to SSK. As per complaint, SSK and its Director Surinder Kumar Bansal and Shefai Bansal and unknown public servants and private persons cheated and defrauded the consortium of the banks to the tune of Rs.187.29 crores by submitting false and forged documents and siphoned of the funds for the purposes other than for which those were sanctioned. Applicant was not arrested by CBI in predicate offence. CBI later filed chargesheet twice which were returned with some objections. The investigation of CBI was confined only to the loan granted by PNB. The Enforcement Directorate registered the ECIR No. ECIR/06/DLZO-I /2018 on 08.05.2018 against SSK and others. After the investigation conducted by ED, the present complaint was filed on the allegations that SSK, Surender Kumar Bansal (applicant herein) and his wife Shefali Bansal and others committed the offence of cheating and forgery to cause a loss to the extent of Rs.187.29 crores to the lender banks and a wrongful gain to themselves and thus, the proceeds of crime of this case is Rs.187.29 crores. Applicant /accused was arrested on 15.11.2022, after more then four years of registration of ECIR, as he allegedly failed to submit the requisite the documents and information.

3. One bail application has been filed on merits and another application of the applicant seeking default bail under Section 167 (2) Cr. P. C. is also pending and the grounds in support of the default bail application are also mentioned in the bail application seeking bail on merits. It has been stated in this application that the applicant was arrested after more than 4 years from the date

of registration of the ECIR. It is argued that no material has been placed on record to show that how much alleged sum represent the proceeds of crime and the complaint filed by ED has merely investigated into the schedule offence, if any. The charge sheet filed by the CBI was returned twice without taking cognizance and as on today no charge sheet filed by CBI is pending. Applicant was not arrested by CBI. In the present complaint, only the alleged proceeds of crime amounting to approximately Rs.66 crores has been identified and it appears from the order of this court dated 24.01.2023 that no money trail has been indicated in the complaint. The applicant started his jewellery business in 2008 and took certain loans for this business and the account was declared NPA on 30.06.2014 and SSK returned substantial amount to the banks. ED has failed to establish a case against the applicant. The applicant satisfies the triple test for grant of bail. The applicant bonafidely availed loans to run a jewellery business and was forced to shut down the business on account of economic slow down. The lead bankers have already initiated proceedings before DRT and NCLT and no criminal cause of action arises in the present case. The allegations in the present case at best merely relate to recovery of loans for which recovery proceedings are already pending. The arrest of accused is not justified specifically when no other person was arrested in this case. ED has not conducted any independent investigation of its own in the present case and the arrest of the applicant is wholly mis-conceived. No schedule offence is made out against the applicant. No evidence has been adduced to substantiate the allegation qua the amount of Rs.187.29 crores. The complaint appears to proceed entirely on the basis of the statements recorded under Section 50 of PMLA and the documents relating to the transaction have not been investigated. Section 91 of the Evidence Act would operate against the statements recorded under Section 50 of PMLA. SSK mortgaged six properties while availing loan and PNB took over the possession of the same and conducted auctions for sale of such properties and sold it only for Rs.28 crores against a minimum value of Rs.46 crores. It was argued that twin conditions of Section 45 of PMLA do not apply to the present case. ED has failed to show how loan amount was diverted to other companies for other purposes. There are invoices on record to show that actual business dealings had taken place. It was argued that the original definition of Section 3 of the PMLA as existed in 2009 shall apply to the facts of this case wherein the legislature provided that ***"Whosoever directly or indirectly attempts to indulge or knowingly assist or knowingly a party or actually involved in any process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime and projecting it as untainted property shall be guilty of offence of Money Laundering".*** It is argued that it is nowhere mentioned in the entire complaint that the applicant projecting proceeds of crime as untainted property and therefore, no case under PMLA is made out. It was also argued that Section 45 of the PMLA shall not apply. It was argued that to satisfy the ingredients of section 3 of PMLA, it has to be shown that a person not only acquired or concealed or possessed or used the proceeds of crime but also projected it as untainted property. The entire complaint does not show as to accused committed any of these acts.

4. For the default bail, it was argued that applicant is entitled to default bail under Section 167(2) of Cr. P. C. in view of the

incomplete charge sheet. It is stated that as per the complaint the investigation in the present case is clearly pending and a right of accused for default bail can not be taken away by filing incomplete charge sheet.

5. Ld. Counsel in support of his submissions has relied upon following judgments:-

- ***(a)*** ***Rakesh Kumar Pal v. State of Assam, 2017(15) SCC 67.***
- ***(b)*** ***Akula Ravi Teja v. State of Andhra Pradesh, 2020 SCC Online AP 1464.***
- ***(c)*** ***Chitra Ramkrishna v. CBI 2022 SCC Online Del 3124.***
- ***(d)*** ***Tunde Gbaja v. Central Bureau of Investigation, 2007 SCC Online Del450.***
- ***(e)*** ***P. V. Vijayaraghavan v. CBI 1984 SCC Online.***
- ***(f)*** ***Manish Gandhi v. State, (order dated 21.12.2017 in MCRC 15397 of 2017).***
- ***(g)*** ***Hari Chand & Raj Pal v. State, 1977 SCC Online Del 31.***
- ***(h)*** ***A. E. Pinto v. CBI 2002 SCC Online Del 638.***
- ***(i)*** ***Vijay Madanlal Choudhary & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors., Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.4634 of 2014 dated 27.07.2022.***
- ***(j)*** ***Hinish Ramchandani and Others v. State of UP and Anr., 2016 SCC Online All. 3891.***
- ***(k)*** ***Hitendra Vishnu Thakur and others. v. State of Maharashtra and others, (1994) 4 Supreme Court Cases 602.***

6. In reply to it, it has been stated on behalf of ED that the complaint of the ED is based on its own investigation. The applicant submitted different balance sheets for the financial years 2008-2009 to the banks for availing loan and another before Registrar of Companies and on the basis of fabricated and

forged balance sheet obtained loan from the banks and obtaining of loan by cheating and forgery itself makes the loan as proceeds of crime. Further the accused alongwith other accused persons entered into sham transaction relating to share capital, share premium, loans, advances and there were only paper transactions on the strength of fake bills and without any actual sale or purchase. The applicant received Rs. 5.38 crores in his bank account from the loan account and utilized the amount in the name of AS Technobuild Pvt. Ltd. The Income Tax Department during search found that against stock of Rs. 171 crores declared in the books only stock worth Rs. 9 crores was physically available. The present bail application is liable to be dismissed in light of twin conditions prescribed under Section 45 of PMLA which have been approved by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Vijay Madan Lal Choudhary (supra).***

7. In response to the default bail, it has been argued that this court has already taken cognizance of the offence finding that the material placed on record by the complainant is sufficient to take cognizance and therefore, the question of default bail does not arise. It is argued that investigation only qua trail of remaining proceeds of crime is pending and same is no ground to grant default bail to the accused. The complaint is complete in all respects.

8. In support of his contention, he relied upon the following judgments:-

(a) ***Y. S. Jagan Mohan Reddy v. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2013) 7 SCC 439.***

(b) ***Nimmagadda Prasad v. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2013) 7 SCC 466.***

(c) *The State of Bihar and Ors. v. Amit Kumar, (2017) 13 SCC 751.*

(d) *Gautam Kundu v. Manoj Kumar, Govt. of India, (2015) 16 SCC 1.*

(e) *Sunil Dahiya v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi), Bail Application Nos. 1212, 1221 and 1222/2016.*

(f) *Union of India v. Hassan Ali Khan & Anr. Criminal Appeal No. 1883 of 2011 (arising out of SLP (Crl. No. 6114 of 2011).*

(g) *Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement v. Chunni Lal Gaba, CRM M 14336-2020 (O&M)*

(h) *P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement, (2019) 9 SCC 24.*

(i) *The Assistant Director Enforcement Directorate v. Dr. V. C. Mohan, Crl. Appeal 21 of 2022, SC.*

(j) *Serious Fraud Invetigation Office v. Nitin Johari & Anr. Crl. Appeal No. 1381 of 2019 @ SLP (Crl.) NO. 7437 of 2019.*

(l) *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Invetigation & Anr. (2021) 10 SCC 773.*

(m) *Bimal Kumar Jain and others v. Directorate of Enforcement, Bail application 112/2021, Crl. M. (Bail) 81/2021 and Bail application 122/2021.*

(n) *Gautam Thapar v. Directorate of Enforcement, Bail application 4185/2021, DHC.*

(o) *Raj Singh Gehlot v. Directorate of Enforcement, Bail application 4295/2021, DHC.*

(p) *Directorate of Enforcement v. Raj Singh Gehlot, MANU/OT/0083/2021.*

(q) *ED v. Sajjan Kumar & Ors. ECIR/DLZO01/09/2019.*

(r) *N. M. Umashabkar & Ors. v. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Crl. O. P. 3381 of 2021, Madras HC.*

(s) *Bindeshwar Ganjhu @ Bindu Ganjhu v. Union of India through Directorate of Enforcement Kaushalya Chamber,*

PP Compound, Ranchi, B. A. No. 16501 of 2021, Ranchi HC & C. A. V. on 19.04.2022.

(t) Rohit Tandon v. The enforcement Directorate, Crl. Appeal No. 1878-1879 of 2017.

(u) Dinesh Dalmia v. CBI, Crl. Appeal No. 1249 of 2007.

(v) Abdul Azeez P. V. & Ors. v. National Investigation Agency, SLP (Crl.) No. 7733 of 2014.

(w) State of Maharashtra v. Sharadchandra Vinayak Dongree & Ors. Crl. Appeal No. 697-703 with 704 of 1994.

(x) Narendra Kumar Amin v. CBI, Crl. Appeal No. 94 of 2015 (arising out of SLP (crl.) No. 9599 of 2013).

(y) Serious Fraud Investigation Office v. Rahul Modi & Ors. Crl. Appeal No. 185-186 of 2022 (arising out of SLP (crl.) No. 5180-5181 of 2019.

(z) Suraj v. State of Delhi NCT, Bail Application No. 120 of 2022.

(aa) Deepender Kumar Srivastava v. State (CBI), Bail Application No. 2542 of 2006.

(ab) Nimmagadda Prasad v. CBI, Crl. Appeal No. 728 of 2013 (arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 9706 of 2012).

9. I have heard the submissions and have perused the record. First I will deal with the default bail application filed under Section 167(2) of Cr. P. C. As per this application, the complaint filed by ED is not complete as it relates only to the alleged fund diversion of loans obtained from PNB and the investigation in respect of loans obtained from other banks of the consortium is still pending. Further, it was claimed that this court itself in the order dated 24.01.2023 and 13.02.2023 has sought queries from ED, who sought four weeks time to file further documents for the purpose of enabling this court to take cognizance and in these facts, the charge sheet/complaint can not be said to be complete.

Reliance in this regard was placed on Judgment of ***Chitra Ramakrishna (supra)***.

10. Record shows that the present complaint was filed on 13.01.2023 and was put for consideration on 24.01.2023 when the court raised certain queries regarding money trail and other relevant aspects for which counsel for ED sought time to file detailed synopsis and complete chart of money trail as well as specification of case property seized. The matter was kept for 21.02.2023. There is nothing in these two orders to suggest that the material filed alongwith the complaint was insufficient to take cognizance. Ld. Counsel for ED on 24.01.2023 only sought time to file detailed synopsis and chart of money trail to assist the court to consider the point of cognizance. Subsequently, on the same complaint and same material this court took cognizance on 10.03.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 4 of PMLA. In these circumstances, it can not be said the complaint is incomplete or that the material filed with the complaint was not sufficient to take cognizance. Otherwise also, during the course of hearing of the habeas corpus writ petition filed on behalf of the applicant, Ld. Senior counsel for the applicant contended that the applicant was not entitled to default bail as the complaint was filed within 60 days and the said submissions is duly recorded in para 3 of the order dated 28.02.2023 passed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in that writ petition. The applicant can not be permitted to take contrary stands before different courts. Coming to the judgment of ***Chitra Ramakrishna (supra)***, in that judgment, it was observed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court that the charge sheet was incomplete as the investigation in respect of the offences punishable under Section 66 of the IT Act 2000, Section

204 of IPC and Section 7 and 12 of PC Act is still pending and was not complete and the Special Judge has not taken the cognizance for want of sanction to prosecute the petitioner therein and another. The charge sheet in that case was filed only for the offences punishable under Section 13(1)(d) and 13(2) of the PC Act and Section 120B of IPC and in those circumstances, it was held that the charge sheet is incomplete as same can not be filed piecemeal. The said judgment is not applicable to the facts before this court. As far as the other judgments relied upon by the counsel for the applicant on the aspect of default bail are concerned, there is no dispute to the law laid down in those judgment that the accused is entitled to default bail if the investigation is not completed within the prescribed period as applicable to that offence but the said judgments are not applicable to the facts before this court as the investigation is complete as far as the offence punishable under Section 4 of PMLA is concerned, which is the only offence under PMLA. Investigation is pending only in respect of remaining proceeds of crime and the complaint can not be said to be incomplete only for this reason. There are no grounds made out for default bail. The application is dismissed.

11. Coming to the second bail application filed on merits, it was argued by the counsel for accused that the twin conditions of section 45 PMLA do not apply to the facts of this case as ED has failed to demonstrate as to how much sum would represent proceeds of crime when the loans had been availed to carry out business and SSK paid back interest to the tune of Rs.61 Crores. The case at best merely relates to recovery of loans and present proceedings have been initiated to exert pressure upon the

applicant. ED knew that the alleged sanctioned loan amount at the time of registration of the ECIR on 08.05.2018 was only Rs.163 crores and yet it has conducted investigation only in relation to loan advance by PNB of Rs.55 crores out of total alleged loan of Rs.163 Crores. The applicant can not be guilty of offence of money laundry unless ED demonstrate how he is connected with the proceeds of crime. ED did not conduct any independent investigation and the entire complaint is copy and paste of CBI second final report. No schedule offence is made out against the applicant as there does not exist any ingredient of offence punishable under Section 420,467,471 of IPC as well as offence punishable under Section 120B of IPC which can not be tried as stand alone predicate offence. It was also submitted that twin conditions of section 45 PMLA were struck down by Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as ***Nikesh Tarachand Shah vs UOI (2018)11 SCC 1*** and were revived only with effect from 19.04.2018 by Parliament after amendment and can not be applicable to this case as alleged offence was committed before 19.04.2018. On the other hand it was argued for ED that twin conditions of Section 45 PMLA duly applies, the applicant knowing dealt with proceeds of crime and used it for personal gains and bail application should be dismissed.

12. The complaint shows that applicant being Director of SSK obtained loan from the consortium of banks. That account was declared NPA and CBI registered FIR on 12.04.2018. Applicant was not arrested in predicate offence. This ECIR was registered on 08.05.2018 and applicant was arrested after more then four years on 15.11.2022. He joined investigation on 26.06.2019, 23.07.2019, 24.02.2021 and on 15.11.2022, when arrested. What

made ED arrest applicant after four years remains unexplained. It is also relevant to note that no other accused was arrested in this matter though allegedly having similar role. The same appears to be use of power arbitrarily by officers of ED. Learned counsel for ED failed to explain as to why no other arrest was made in this case. How authorities pick and chose in arresting and not arresting is best known to them only. Can authorities having power to arrest, exercise its right on whims and fancies. Further, applicant is also is an accused in another case under PMLA bearing ECIR/01/DLZO-II/2017 of which proceeding are pending before another court. Applicant was not arrested in that case and has been granted bail. So the action of ED arresting applicant in this case and not in other case and arresting him only in this case, appears to be arbitrary use of powers.

13. Coming to the merits, admittedly the predicate offence if any was committed in 2009 when credit facilities were obtained from consortium of banks. The credit facilities were secured by mortgage of immovable properties and hypothecation of stocks. It can not be said that there was any intention to cheat, more so when an amount of Rs. 61 crores was repaid. The applicant mortgaged six properties while availing credit facilities, possession of which was taken by PNB and auctioned. The recovery proceedings before DRT and NCLT are already pending. Other wise also this court is not concerned about the predicate offence, wherein applicant was not arrested, but the offence of money laundering, as it stood that time.

14. It was argued for the applicant that no offence as defined under Section 3 of the PMLA 2002 as applicable to the case is made out against applicant. It was argued that the original

definition of offence of Money Laundering as defined in the Act of 2002 will apply to the present case and not the subsequent definition which was amended in 2012 effective from 03.01.2013. It was argued that in the original definition it was must that a person should have projected the proceeds of crime as untainted property. In the present case, the applicant has nowhere projected the proceeds of crime as untainted property and therefore, is not guilty of offence of Money Laundering. In support, Ld. Counsel has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in ***Hitendra Vishu Thakur & Ors. (supra)***.

15. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in this case has talked about whether the amendments brought by the legislature shall be prospective or retrospective. In para 26 of this case, Hon'ble Apex Court laid down that a statute which affects substantive rights is presumed to be prospective unless made retrospective.

16. The definition of the offence of money laundering as it existed in original Act of 2002 is reproduced herein:-

> "**Section 3 - Whosoever directly or indirectly attempts to indulge or knowingly assist or knowingly a party or actually involved in any process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime and projecting it as untainted property shall be guilty of offence of money-laundering".**

17. As per the original definition of money laundering, a person can be held guilty for the offence of money laundering, if he directly or indirectly attempts to indulge or knowingly assists or is a party or is actually involved in any process or activity connected with proceeds of crime and project it as untainted property. So for constituting an offence of money laundering, it was not only necessary that the person should be connected with

the proceeds of crime but it was also essential that he should project it as untainted property. Both the conditions should be satisfied. This definition was amended in 2012 by the amendment brought into force w.e.f. 03.01.2013 and in place of words "proceeds of crime and projecting" the words "proceeds of crime including its concealment, possession, acquisition or use and projecting or claiming" were substituted. I find force in the contention of Ld. Counsel for applicant that the original definition as it stood in 2002 shall apply to the facts of this case and not the one which was amended w.e.f. 03.01.2013. As per the law of Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down in Hitender Vishnu Thakur (supra), the amendment in a statute which affects substantive rights is presumed to be prospective. The amendment in the definition of money laundering made in Section 3 of the Act affects substantive rights and as such is prospective in nature and cannot be said to be retrospective either expressly or by necessary indentment. It cannot be said as argued by Ld. Counsel for ED that the offence of money laundering is a continuing offence till the proceeds of crime are recovered and the definition of Section 3 as amended w.e.f. 03.01.2013 shall apply. It is for the prosecution to unearth the proceeds of crime and only because the prosecution has failed to unearth the proceeds of crime, it cannot be said that the offence of money laundering continues. The word concealment does not find mention in original definition of money laundering. The present complaint was registered in 2018, accused was arrested on 15.11.2022 and the present complaint was filed on 13.01.2023 and since almost last five years, the prosecution has not been able to unearth the proceeds of crime except a sum of Rs. 66 Crores. As per para 16 of the complaint, the investigation for identification of remaining proceeds of crime is under process. When the same shall be identified is not clear. It cannot be said that the offence of money laundering will continue for eternity or till the proceeds of crime are identified by ED. The offence of money laundering if any in the present case was committed prior to the amendment in the definition of money laundering provided in Section 3 of the PMLA when applicant was allegedly connected with proceeds of crime.

18. Now, let us examine as to whether the offence of money laundering alleged to be committed in this case falls in the definition of Section 3 as provided in the original Act. The entire complaint of the ED is silent regarding the projection of proceeds of crime as untainted property. The entire complaint reflects that it is basically copy and paste of the investigation conducted by CBI in the predicate offence though reproduced in different format. The entire complaint talks about the manner in which the loan was obtained by presenting a purported fabricated balance sheet for the financial year 2008-09. The entire complaint is based on the statements recorded U/s 50 of the PMLA and there is no investigation by the ED of its own regarding the genuineness of the bills seized during investigation nor regarding the genuineness of the two different balance sheets presented before ROC and the consortium of banks. The ED is required not only to show that applicant directly or indirectly indulged in an activity connected with proceeds of crime but is also required to show that he projected the proceeds of crime as untainted property. The entire complaint revolves around the allegation that how the loan was acquired and how the proceeds of crime were

layered. Only, para 21 of the complaint, which is the concluding paragraph, says that the complainant has established that the accused knowingly was involved in process of concealment, possession, acquisition, use and projecting the proceeds of crime as untainted property but has nowhere explained as to how the accused projected the proceeds of crime as untainted property.

19. From the above discussion, it appears that the ingredients of the offence of money laundering as defined in the original definition U/s 3 of the PMLA, 20022 are not made out in this case. If the ingredients of offence as defined in the original act and as applicable to the case are not made out, then the question of applicability of twin conditions of Section 45, PMLA shall not arise. The twin conditions of section 45 PMLA shall not apply to facts of present case.

20. I have read the judgments relied upon by the parties. The facts before this court are entirely different as discussed above. The question of applicability of original definition of money laundering was not an issue in any of the judgments relied upon by ED. Same are not applicable to the facts before me.

21. Further, ED has filed this complaint mentioning only qua loan taken from PNB, as were the returned charge-sheets filed by CBI. No investigation has been done by ED in respect of loans by other banks. How ED claims proceeds of crime to be around Rs. 189 crores is not known. Has ED investigated what CBI has not yet investigated is not explained. It appears that ED has arrived at this figure only on the basis of balance reflected in books of accounts of the banks. Can accrued interest on loan be a part of proceeds of crime as claimed by ED. The initial loan was only Rs. 161 Crores. In my opinion, it cannot be.

22. Coming to the aspect of flight risk, applicant was permitted to visit UK by Hon'ble High Court in WP(Crl) No. 11367/2021 on 08.10.2021 and duly returned to India after visit. There can not be any flight risk. There is no apprehension of applicant tampering with evidence and influencing the witnesses as statements under section 50 PMLA have already been recorded and evidence already seized during raids. The applicant can not be kept in pre-trial incarceration. Admittedly no further investigation has been done in this case after arrest of applicant on 15.11.2022. It can not be ignored that he has a family to support including children and old aged father. Non-confession cannot be said to be non-cooperation or a ground to arrest. As already discussed ED has failed to explain arbitrary use of power of arrest.

23. After considering all facts, the application seeking bail on merits is allowed, the applicant is admitted to bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 5,00,000/- with one surety of like amount subject to following conditions:-

> *1. The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the court;*
>
> *2. The applicant shall surrender his passport, if not yet surrendered yet within a week of release from custody;*
>
> *3. The applicant shall co-operate and participate in investigation as and when directed by IO and shall provide his mobile number to IO;*
>
> *4. The applicant shall not tamper with evidence and shall not influence the witnesses.*

24. The bail applications stand disposed of. Nothing said herein-above shall affect merits of the case.

25. Put up on date fixed i.e. **17.04.2023** for purpose already fixed.

**ANNOUNCED IN THE OPEN
COURT TODAY i.e. ON 31.03.2023**

**(AMIT KUMAR)
SPECIAL JUDGE, PC ACT, CBI-04,
ROUSE AVENUE COURTS,
NEW DELHI**