

Bail Matters 530/2026
STATE Vs. ANSHUL BHATNAGAR
FIR No. 166/2022
PS- (Greater Kailash)
u/s 420/467/468/471/120B IPC

14.03.2026

File has been taken up today since 02nd March, 2026 was declared holiday on account of Holi festival by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order No. 64/G-4/Genl.-I/DHC dated 27.02.2026.

Present application has been taken up in terms of Order No. 10 dated 06.03.2026 passed by Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge, SED, Saket Courts, New Delhi. (Roster)

This is an application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Anshul Bhatnagar for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: None for the State.

Sh. Ramendra Mohan Singh, Sh. Avinash Sarat and
Sh. Durgesh Rai, Ld. Counsel for the
applicant/accused.

IO/SI Pawan Patel, PS GK-1, New Delhi.

1. The regular Ld. Addl. PP for the State, attached with this court, is on leave today.

2. Vide this order, I shall adjudicate upon the regular bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Anshul Bhatnagar. Arguments were heard at length, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

3. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been wrongly implicated by the police

in the present matter as he has nothing to do with the alleged offences. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused was working as a Retail Associate with Cars24 Services Pvt. Ltd. From 05.10.2020 to 13.05.2022. Ld. Counsel further submitted that applicant/accused has not been named in the present FIR, therefore, his custodial interrogation is not required. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused has no involvement in the loan transactions and his name does not appear in any loan documents, bank records, FIR or RTO ownership details since the ICICI Bank sanctioned an auto loan of Rs. 54,00,000/- to a person namely Abhishek. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the allegations levelled against the applicant/accused are false and fabricated and that he has no criminal antecedents. Ld. Counsel further submitted that applicant/accused has apprehension of being arrested in the matter. Ld. Counsel also submitted that applicant/accused herein is ready to join the investigation as and when IO calls him. Ld Counsel thus, submitted that anticipatory bail ought to be granted to accused and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him by this Court.

4. *Per contra* IO/SI Pawan Patel vehemently opposed the bail application as per law. IO further submitted that the applicant/accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Ld. ASJ Pranjali Aneja, ASJ, South East District vide order dated 26.02.2026 and thereafter, he joined the investigation on 07.03.2026, but he failed to provide a satisfactory explanation as to why he used his parents' mobile numbers for booking cars for

inspection on the Cars24 platform and that his name has also been surfaced in the disclosure statements of other accused persons involved in the case. IO further submitted that the parents of the applicant/accused stated that they have no idea when he misused their phone for inspection and they were not aware about it.

5. I have heard the arguments addressed by the opposite parties and also perused the record.

6. As per the IO's report, all the other accused persons in the present case have already been duly interrogated and either arrested or bound down during the course of investigation and after investigation, the main chargesheet against the said accused persons was filed before the court concerned and subsequently, a supplementary chargesheet qua the applicant/accused has been filed before the court concerned also. Further, during the course of arguments, IO submitted that the investigation qua the present applicant/accused stands substantially completed and therefore, at this stage, no custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is required in the present case. Besides that, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused also submitted that the applicant/accused is ready to join the investigation as and when required by the IO.

7. In the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the submissions made, I deem it fit to grant the anticipatory bail to accused person namely Anshul Bhatnagar on the following conditions:-

a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.

30,000/- each with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO concerned.

b) The applicant is directed not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

c) The applicant shall join investigation as and when called by the IO.

d) The applicant is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.

e) The applicant shall give his address to the IO and if, he changes the addresses, he shall intimate the same to the IO.

f) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize, any prosecution witness.

8. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the anticipatory bail application stands disposed of.

9. Copy of this order be given dasti.

(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)
ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),
South East District, Saket Court,
New Delhi /14.03.2026