

Bail Matters 873/2026
STATE Vs. SUSHIL
FIR No. 136/2024
PS- (Crime Branch-South East)
u/s 409/201/419/420/467/468/471/474/120B IPC

04.04.2026

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 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Sushil for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. S. K. Kain, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Sanjay Rathi (through VC) and Sh. Manish Malik, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.
IO/Inspector Arun Sindhu is present.

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

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused was arrested in the present case on 06.03.2026 when he was called for joining the investigation. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and that there is no direct evidence or link connecting him to the alleged offences. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused had already served as a Delhi Police constable and he was selected through a proper recruitment process, with a clean service record and no prior misconduct. Ld. Counsel

further submitted that the case is based largely on documents and electronic records, already in possession of the investigating agency, and no recovery or incriminating material has been found from him. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused had cooperated with the investigation, joined earlier when called, and his custodial interrogation is no longer required. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the allegations are described as vague, speculative, and based on suspicion, with no concrete proof of his involvement. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the earlier bail application of the applicant/accused was dismissed by Ld. CJM, South East District vide order dated 01.04.2026. Ld. Counsel further submitted that in the present matter, co-accused persons namely Amit, Sahil and Jatin Dahiya have already been granted bail by this court vide orders dated 25.03.2026, 02.04.2026 and 02.04.2026 respectively and that the role of the present applicant/accused is similar to them and therefore, the present applicant/accused may also be granted bail on the ground of parity. Ld. Counsel thus, submitted that applicant/accused ought to be granted bail and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him while granting the bail.

3. *Per contra* Ld. Addl. PP for the State along with IO vehemently opposed the bail application citing the gravity of the alleged offences as one of the main grounds. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the specific allegations against the applicant are grave in nature as he did not appear himself in the written examination and got selected in Delhi Police; he got benefitted

from the fraudulent act by securing a government job; he became part of a larger criminal conspiracy involving multiple accused persons, including middlemen, solvers, and even officials. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the applicant/accused is the original candidate, who had applied for the government job for the post of constable in Delhi Police. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the investigation of the case is at very nascent stage and is yet to be completed and that other members of crime syndicate are yet to be arrested. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that there is strong possibility that if the applicant/accused is granted bail, he may influence/threaten the material witnesses and tamper with the evidences and thus, the applicant/accused ought not to be granted bail. However, he along with IO fairly conceded that the role of the present applicant/accused is similar to the co-accused persons namely Amit, Sahil and Jatin Dahiya, who have already been granted bail by this court.

4. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the present FIR was registered on the complaint of the Under Secretary (PEA), Staff Selection Commission (SSC), wherein it was revealed that multiple candidates had resorted to impersonation in the Delhi Police Constable (Executive) Examination, 2023. During investigation, it emerged that the applicant/accused Amit, who was an original candidate, had engaged an impersonator (solver) to appear in the written examination on his behalf in lieu of monetary consideration. It has further been alleged that a well-organized racket/syndicate

was operating, wherein candidates were charged approximately ₹15–20 lakhs for securing selection through unfair means.

5. The allegations against the applicant/accused pertain to the offences u/s 409/201/419/420/467/468/471/120-B IPC arising out of an alleged impersonation racket in the Delhi Police Constable Examination, conducted by SSC. The prosecution case, as reflected from the reply, is that the applicant/accused had allegedly secured his selection through unfair means by engaging a solver/impersonator. However, during the course of arguments, it was brought to the fore that the investigation in the present case is substantially complete. Main chargesheet as well as supplementary chargesheet have already been filed before the court concerned. Admittedly, the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is no longer required. No specific material has been brought on record to show that further detention of the applicant/accused is necessary for any investigative purpose.

6. During the course of arguments, it has been fairly conceded by Ld. Addl. PP along with IO that the role of the present applicant/accused is similar to that of co-accused persons namely Amit, Sahil and Jatin Dahiya, who have already been granted bail by this court vide orders dated 25.03.2026, 02.04.2026 and 02.04.2026. Further, it has been alleged that the evidences in the present case appears to be documentary and electronic in nature including biometric data, photographs and digital records. Such evidence is already in possession of the investigating agency and therefore, there is not much likelihood

of tampering by the applicant/accused. Further, it has been reported that several co-accused persons in the present case have already been granted bail by the concerned courts. It is pertinent to note that the trial in such matters involving multiple accused persons and voluminous documentary evidence is likely to take a considerable period of time. Continued incarceration of the applicant/accused for an indefinite period would not serve the ends of justice.

7. In the aforementioned circumstances, taking into account the submissions and the fact that the ground of parity is made out and further, investigation is complete, main-chargesheet as well as supplementary chargesheet have been filed before the concerned court, and further, the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is not required and also that, no previous involvement of the applicant/accused has been reported by the IO in any other criminal case, I deem it fit to grant regular bail to accused Sushil, on his furnishing personal bond with surety bond of Rs. 30,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of Ld. JMFC/Link JMFC/Duty JMFC/Court concerned, subject to the following conditions:

i) The applicant/accused shall not try to contact or influence the complainant/victim in any manner;

ii) He shall not tamper with evidence in any manner and shall regularly appear before the concerned court on each and every date of hearing; and

iii) He shall also furnish his mobile phone and mobile phone of his surety to the IO and shall keep his mobile phone operational round the clock and shall share his Google PIN to IO.

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 regular bail application stands disposed of.

9. In compliance of **Sanjay Singh Vs. State (Govt of N.C.T of Delhi) Writ Petition Criminal 974/2022**, copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent to convey the order to inmate.

10. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)
ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),
South East District, Saket Court,
New Delhi /04.04.2026