

Bail Matters 674/2026
STATE Vs. JEESHAN ALI
FIR No. 102/2025
PS- (Crime Branch-South East)
u/s 221/132/318(4)/112/61(2)/3(5) BNS

16.03.2026

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 Jeeshan Ali for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. S. K. Kain, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. M. N. Siddiqui, Mashi Alam and Danim Huda,
Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.

1. Vide this order, I shall adjudicate upon the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Jeeshan Ali. Arguments were heard at length, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present matter and that all the allegations levelled against him are baseless and frivolous in nature and there is not an iota of evidence in support of the same. Ld. Counsel further submitted that there is not any direct, distinct, or overt act on the part of the applicant/accused warranting his custodial interrogation. Ld. Counsel further submitted that as per the contents of the FIR, the prosecution case arises out of an alleged incident relating to issuance of illegal stickers/marks and obstruction of a public

servant while discharging official duties. However, he has been named without any specific role, recovery, or material evidence linking him to the alleged offence. Ld. Counsel further submitted that in other case FIR No. 101/2025, PS Crime Branch, the applicant/accused has already been granted bail by Ld. CJM, South East. Ld. Counsel further submitted that there is no recovery or discovery to be effected from the present applicant/accused and that the alleged role of the applicant is based on a disclosure statement of the co-accused which is not admissible in law. Ld. Counsel also submitted that the applicant/accused is ready to join the investigation as and when required by the IO. Ld Counsel thus, submitted that the applicant/accused ought to be granted anticipatory bail and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him.

3. *Per contra* Ld. Addl PP for State vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application citing the gravity of the offences as one of the main grounds. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the investigation of the case is at initial stage and is yet to be completed as several members of this crime syndicate are still yet to be identified and apprehended, and the present applicant/accused herein was operating and controlling all such persons and he appeared to be the mastermind of the said criminal syndicate, therefore, his custodial interrogation is very much required for proper investigation of the case. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the applicant/accused has previous involvement in three criminal cases of extortion and cheating as he is a habitual criminal. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that if

applicant/accused is granted anticipatory bail, there is strong possibility of him indulging in similar kind of activity, threatening/influencing the material witnesses, tampering with the evidence and thus, anticipatory bail ought not to be granted to the applicant/accused.

4. I heard the arguments and also perused the material available on record.

5. During the course of arguments, it was brought to the fore that the present applicant/accused herein is the head of the organised crime syndicate and this crime syndicate was not only cheating with Delhi Traffic Police, but also the many transporters and individual drivers and that the present applicant/accused was operating the co-accused Shivam Sharma and he was providing the Challa/badge/markas to him and the applicant/accused herein also received the proceeds of crime through various channels which needs in depth investigation. Further, as per the report of IO, applicant/accused has been previously found involved in three other criminal cases i.e. i). FIR No. 101/2025, PS Crime Branch, u/s 221/132/318(4)/61(2)/112/3(5) BNS, ii). FIR No. 281/2020, PS Palwal City, Haryana, u/s 384/388/120B IPC, and iii). FIR No. 438/2020, PS Rohtak, Haryana, u/s 384/120B IPC and that he is a habitual criminal/offender. It is thus, apparent that the applicant/accused has not mended his recalcitrant ways. Therefore, the accused does not deserve any leniency as there is every apprehension of him being involved in commission of similar offence again.

6. Further, as per the report of IO, during investigation, details of Paytm account of co-accused Shivam Sharma were obtained wherein two transactions of Rs. 40,000/- and Rs. 8200/- were reflected as transferred amount in the account of Nazra, the wife of the applicant/accused herein, and around 1 lakh was also transferred in the account of Salman (the partner of Jeeshan Ali) through multiple transactions. Further, details of other accounts of co-accused Shivam Sharma has been obtained and investigation qua the other financial transactions between accused persons is underway. The investigation of the present case is at initial stage and is yet to be completed and several members of this crime syndicate are still yet to be indentified/apprehended. Besides that, the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is very much required in the matter.

7. In the aforementioned circumstances, taking into the account the gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the accused herein, the fact that investigation has still not been completed and the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is very much required to unearth the whole conspiracy and nexus and further, the accused has previous involvement in three other criminal cases and therefore, the possibility of indulging in similar kind of activity and influencing the witnesses also cannot be ruled out, I am of the opinion that anticipatory bail ought not to be granted to the accused Jeeshan Ali at this juncture. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application is hereby dismissed.

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 /16.03.2026