

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. 67/24
Charge-sheet No. 18
Date of Institution: 04.07.2024
IA No. 1/26

18.03.2026

ORDER

1. This Order shall decide bail application u/s 483 BNSS moved on behalf of applicant/accused A-3 Pushpendra Sharma 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 17.02.2026, the present applicant/accused A-3 Pushpendra Sharma 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 three contracts amounting Rs. 5,91,044/- to A-3 Sh. Pushpendra Sharma, Prop. M/s Shivam Enterprises.

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 even got 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 vide their letters respectively have intimated that the tender ID Nos. 2016_PWD_107239_1 and 2016_PWD_114052_1 were published and uploaded and their BID Numbers mentioned in the documents were genuine, however, the Tender ID No. 2016_PWD_103913_1 was not published or uploaded on the website of Govt. of NCT of Delhi and the BID Number mentioned in the documents was false and the digital signatures of Singh Ram Pal Singh Tomar, Asstt. Director (H) were shown only on paper falsely to show the due process of e-tendering.

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 IDs were allegedly kept in the file by giving an impression that physical copies qua Tender IDs were downloaded from the website. However, the documents relating to the said Tender IDs were 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 IDs do 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 orders were awarded to A-3 Sh. Pushendra Sharma, Prop. M/s Shivam Enterprises 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 A-3 Sh. Pushendra Sharma, Prop. M/s Shivam Enterprises.

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 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. 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/accused was not arrested during investigation of the case.

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

11. 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.

12. 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 applicant 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 and no other fact was brought to the knowledge of the court that post filing of the charge-sheet or just prior to the filing of the charge-sheet any fact

has come to the knowledge of the investigating agency requiring the detention of any of the applicant. The ultimate guilt and innocence shall be determined during the trial.

13. In view of the above-mentioned discussion and also taking into consideration the totality of facts and circumstances, the applicant/accused 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.

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

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

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

*(Dictated and announced in the
Open Court today i.e. on 18.03.2026)*

(HASAN ANZAR)
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-03,
RADC/New Delhi/18.03.2026