

CBI No. 132/2024 (RC 0032024A0035)  
CBI Vs. Mohd. Arif & Ors.  
P.S : CBI/ACB/New Delhi.  
U/s 61(2) of BNS 2023 r/w 7,7A & 8 PC Act  
1988 (As amended in 2018)

27.02.2026

Present : Sh. Hari Mohan, Ld. Sr. Public Prosecutor for CBI.  
IO/Dy. SP Sunil Kr. Pandey.

A-1 Mohd Arif & A-3 Kishlaya Sharan Singh  
are on bail.

A-2 Bhagwat Sharan Singh, A-4 Raj Kumar  
Chugh and A-5 Gopal Nath Kapooria are in person.

Sh. Rishabh Shukla & Sh. Abhishek Mahal, Ld.  
Counsel for A-1.

Sh. Manoj Pant and Sh. Divyang Kishwan,  
Ld. Counsel for A-2.

Sh. Shishir Mathur & Sh. Sarthak Gupta,  
Ld. Counsel for A- 3.

Sh. Pulkit Shree, Ld. Counsel for A-4.

Sh. Yashvir Sethi and Sh. Pranav Sharma,  
Ld. Counsel for A-5.

Separate Vakaltnamas are filed by respective  
counsel(s) on behalf of A-2, A-3, A-4 and A-5. Be taken on  
record.

Separate bail applications under Section 483 of  
BNSS 2023 are moved on behalf of **A-2 Bhagwat Sharan Singh,**  
**A-4 Raj Kumar Chugh** and **A-5 Gopal Nath Kapooria** for grant  
of regular bail.

It is, inter alia, stated in the applications that the applicants/accused persons have been falsely implicated in the present case by the CBI. There is no evidence qua them. It is further submitted that the applicants/accused persons co-operated in the investigation and hence, the CBI chose not to arrest the accused persons. Further, it is submitted that chargesheet in the mater has been filed. It is also submitted on behalf of accused persons that no useful purpose would be served by sending the accused persons behind the bar as trial of the case is going to take considerable time.

It is further submitted that the applicants/accused persons have deep root in the society and there is no likelihood of their influencing the witnesses or tampering with the evidence.

It is also argued on behalf of accused persons that since the accused persons were not arrested during the course of investigation, their case is squarely covered by the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled **Satender Kumar Antil V. CBI SLP No. 5191/2021 dated 11.07.2022**. Reliance is also placed upon judgment in **Sudhir Nathani V. State 2003 (3) JCC 1883 and Court of its Own Motion V. CBI 2004 (1) JCC 308**. Hence, prayer is made for grant of regular bail to the accused persons/applicants.

Ld. Public Prosecutor for the CBI has opposed the present bail applications.

**Heard and considered.**

As per record, the accused person/applicants herein were not arrested during the course of investigation. The record reflects that they have co-operated during the course of investigation. Therefore, relying upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Antil ( supra) case, A-2 Bhagwat**

**Sharan Singh, A-4 Raj Kumar Chugh and A-5 Gopal Nath Kapooria are enlarged on regular bail subject to the following conditions:**

- I. The applicants/accused persons shall furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- each with one surety each of the like amount.**
- II. The applicants/accused persons shall not directly or indirectly try to contact or influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence.**
- III. The applicants/accused persons shall not leave the country without permission of the Court.**
- IV. The applicants/accused persons shall intimate the Court about the change of address if any during the period of bail.**
- V. The applicants/accused persons shall regularly appear in the court during the trial.**
- VI Violation of any of the conditions shall result in cancellation of their bail.**

At this stage, bail bonds are also furnished on behalf of A-2, A-4 and A-5. The same are accepted. The respective FDRs be retained.

At this stage, Soft-copy of chargesheet alongwith documents supplied to the accused persons.

Ld. Counsel for the accused persons seek time to go through the same.

Be listed for scrutiny of documents on **13<sup>th</sup> March 2026.**

(GAGANDEEP SINGH)  
Special Judge, PC Act, CBI-04  
Rouse Avenue District Courts,  
New Delhi: 27.02.2026