

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HASAN ANZAR,
SPECIAL JUDGE, PC ACT (CBI-03),
ROUSE AVENUE DISTRICT COURT, NEW DELHI

CBI Vs. Trilok Chand & Ors.
CC No. 50/24
Charge Sheet No. 3
(IA No. 01/26)
RC No.32(A)/2017

27.03.2026

ORDER

1. This Order shall decide bail application u/s 483 BNSS moved on behalf of applicant/accused A-3 Sh. Ravinder u/s 120-B r/w 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC r/w 13(2) r/w 13 (1) d of PC Act, 1988 and substantive offences u/s 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC for release on bail in the above-mentioned case.

2. Vide detailed Order dated 23.01.2026, the present applicant/accused A-3 Sh. Ravinder was summoned in the present case.

3. The allegations in the present charge-sheet are to the effect that Ravinder Kumar, Asstt. Director (Horticulture) (*Now Deceased*), Public Servant in connivance with Trilok Chand, Section Officer (*Now Deceased*), Public Servant and other persons had illegally awarded a contract/working order amounting Rs.1,97,960/- to Sh. Ravinder, Proprietor M/s Park and Nursery.

4. As per charge-sheet, it is revealed during investigation that Ravinder Kumar (Now Deceased), Public Servant after obtaining technical sanction alongwith estimate/abstract cost from the relevant authority for floating a tender and obtained a specific NIT Number from the office of Deputy Director (Horticulture). The investigation revealed that instead of uploading NIT (Notice to Invite) on e-Procurement site of Government of NCT of Delhi i.e. <https://govtprocurement.delhi.gov.in>, a false tender ID was created and fake/false bid numbers were mentioned and fake bids were stated to have been opened on various dates.

5. During the course of investigation, NIC and Delhi e-Governance Society have intimated through their letters dated 12.06.2018 and 26.03.2018 that tender 2016_PWD_106984_1 was never uploaded/published on the e-Procurement Site of Govt. of NCT of Delhi in the year 2016 and further intimation that BID Number mentioned in the documents were also false/fake.

6. It was portrayed that bids etc. were received whereas, no actual Bids etc. were received and the physical copies of the documents with regard to the above Tender ID was allegedly kept in the file by giving an impression that physical copies qua Tender ID was downloaded from the website. However, the documents relating to the said Tender ID was created by accused persons in conspiracy with each other. The charge-sheet further explains that in normal tender process, the digital keys are used to upload a tender on the website. Since, no tender was uploaded so the question of usage of any digital keys

against the said tender ID does not arise. The physical copies of the documents available against the tender IDs appear to be a product of forgery and were seemingly created to give impression that those necessary formalities had been duly complied and the contract/work order was awarded to Ravinder, Proprietor M/s Park and Nursery by declaring it as L-1. It is further alleged that Trilok Chand (*Now Deceased*) Public Servant made false entries regarding execution of work in the Measurement Books and prepared false abstract of work and on the basis of which bills were prepared and signed by Ravinder Kumar (*Now Deceased*) and payments were released to Ravinder, Proprietor M/s Park and Nursery.

7. The Quality Assurance Inspection Team in its Inspection Report dated 28.11.2016 with respect to the Tender IDs and the subsequent execution of work were found to be severely deficient/short comings/lacunae in pursuance to the separate agreements. The Statements of members of Quality Assurance Inspection Team such as Sh. Praveen Kumar Sharma, Sh. V.K. Gupta and Sh. S.R. Gupta were also recorded.

8. It is contended in the bail application that applicant/accused has fully cooperated during the investigation. The present case is based on documentary evidence and number of witnesses were cited in the chargesheet. The applicant/accused was not arrested by the CBI during the investigation of the present case and the conclusion of the trial shall take shall take substantial time and therefore, no useful purpose shall be served by incarcerating the applicant/accused. It is

also submitted that applicant has deep roots in the society and there are no risks of absconding or influencing witnesses. It is further contended that applicant has appeared before the court on the very first date of hearing upon the receipt of the summons.

9. On 16.03.2026, an application for taking additional ground was filed on behalf of Applicant/Accused and it was also submitted that accused Ravinder Rathore was falsely and incorrectly charge-sheeted in the present case and he was never associated with M/s Park & Nursery and reference was also made to the Bank Statement of Devender Kumar. It is also submitted that the applicant/accused is/was not the proprietor of M/s Park & Nursery.

10. On 25.03.2026, a status report was filed in the Court in which apart from making reference to the statement of applicant/accused it was also stated that a letter/Office Order No. 61/2011 dated 28.04.2011 (part of D-29) indicating Sh. Denedra Kumar as the sole properietor of M/s Park & Nursery alongwith an affidavit pertaining to authoriziation issued by Sh. Devender Kumar to authorize present applicant/accused Ravinder Rathore for operation of the bank account,deposit/withdrawal of money, deposit of cheque, etc on behalf of Devnder Kumar and made the applicant/accused the authorized sigantory. It is further contended that the certified copy of bank statement of M/s Park & Nursery shows that Rs. 3,00,000/- (including the credited sum and existing balance) was withdrawn through a self-cheque duly signed by applicant/accused. It is further stated that aspect regarding proprietorship of Devender Kumar was

not investigated and if so, the further investigation could be carried out to this effect.

11. Ld. PP for CBI has left it to the discretion of the court to pass an appropriate order and relied upon the reply filed by the CBI. It is contended that applicant was not arrested during investigation of the case.

12. I have considered the submissions made by both the sides.

13. It is evident from the charge-sheet and the supporting material on record that the prosecution has relied on an extensive documentary record comprising number of documents of more than 3500 pages and number of witnesses were cited. A careful perusal of the list of witnesses reveals that most of the witnesses are associated with the various documents relied upon by the prosecution to substantiate the charges against the accused person. It appears from the status report as well as the documents/authority letter (D-29) available on record, it appears that proprietor of M/s Park & Nursery is Devender Kumar and the status report concedes that the said aspect has not been investigated properly.

14. It is further observed that numerous documents were relied upon by the CBI and large number of witnesses were cited in the charge sheet and hence there is no possibility of the conclusion of the trial in near future. No fact was disclosed in the reply that during the investigation any of the applicants had influenced any witness(s) or

cause hindrance in the investigation and it is primarily for this reason, the investigating agency did not choose to arrest the applicant/accused.

15. From the material placed on record, it appears that the possibility of applicant/accused being not the proprietor is not ruled out, moreover, whether applicant/accused is a proprietor of M/s Park & Nursery shall be determined at an appropriate stage of proceedings either at the stage of arguments on charge/final stages and no detailed finding is being returned in order to avoid prejudice to the case of prosecution or defence but it would suffice to state that applicant/accused has made out a case for grant of bail.

16. In view of the above-mentioned discussion and also taking into consideration the totality of facts and circumstances, the applicant/accused Ravinder Rathore is admitted to bail on his furnishing personal bond and one surety in the sum of Rs.25,000/- each, subject to the following conditions ;

i. Applicant/accused shall not try to influence any witness(s) either directly or indirectly, or influence the investigation in any manner.

ii. Applicant/Accused and his surety shall intimate the change in address, if any, during the pendency of the case to the court as well as the investigating agency.

iii. Applicant/Accused shall attend each and every date of hearing unless exempted from personal appearance and in the absence of the accused person, a duly instructed counsel shall appear before the court.

iv. Applicant/Accused shall attend the date of hearing and in the event, if the accused attends the proceedings through video conferencing, he or she shall strictly adhere to the Hon'ble Delhi High Court Video Conferencing Rules, 2025.

v. Applicant/Accused shall furnish his mobile number in the bail bond.

vi. The accused shall not leave the country without permission of the court.

vii. Applicant/Accused shall deposit his passport in the court and in the event if he does not hold the passport, an affidavit/undertaking shall be filed by him to the same effect.

viii. Applicant/Accused shall comply the conditions as stipulated under Section 480(3) BNSS.

17. Nothing herein stated above shall tantamount to an expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

18. With these observations, the bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused is allowed and stands disposed of.

19. As prayed, copy of the order be given *dasti* to both the sides.

*(Dictated and announced in the
Open Court today i.e. on 27.03.2026)*

(HASAN ANZAR)
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-03,
RADC/New Delhi/27.03.2026