

Bail Matter no. 114/2026
State Vs. Pramod Kumar
FIR No. 447/2025
PS: Burari
U/s: 420/406/120B IPC

03.02.2026

This is an application under Sec. 482 BNSS filed on behalf of applicant/accused namely Pramod Kumar for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present : Sh. Shreyas Pragyanan, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Jitender Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.
SI Rahul on behalf of IO SI Mohit in person.
Adv. Ms. Jai Shree Gupta with complainant in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that no bail application is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi or the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant submits that the accused has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the commission of offence. He further submits that main accused in the present case is Anwar who had entered into contract with the complainant. He further submits that there was an arbitration clause in the contract and FIR has been wrongly registered in the present case. He further submits that accused/applicant is ready to join the investigation. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is not required and hence no fruitful purpose will be served by the arrest of accused/applicant.

Complainant who is present before the Court submits that accused/applicant and his associates sold him a property which was not owned by them. He submits that he paid Rs. 10,00,000/- to accused and his associates 05 years back and till date, neither the said amount had been returned to him nor the property has been delivered to him and he is running from pillar to post for seeking justice.

Ld. Addl PP for the State submits that accused/applicant and his associates had entered into agreement to sell with the complainant on 30.08.2021 and the said agreement to sell has been duly signed by the accused/applicant. He further submits that accused Pramod had shown the chain of documents of the property to the complainant. He further submits that accused Pramod had entered into the MoU with the complainant but the MoU was also violated by accused/applicant and his associates. He further submits that notice under Section 35(3) BNSS was served upon the accused/applicant but he did not join the investigation. He further submits that the specimen signature of the accused/applicant are yet to be taken. He further submits that custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is necessary for tracing the chain of forged property documents. He further submits that present bail application should be dismissed.

I have heard the submissions and perused the record.

The alleged offence committed by the accused/applicant is serious in nature. The complainant has suffered a huge loss of Rs. 10,00,000/- due to the act of

accused/applicant and his associates. The accused/applicant conspired with his associates and sold a property to the complainant which never belonged to them. Notice under Section 35(3) BNSS was served upon the accused/applicant but he did not join the investigation in the present case. Custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is necessary.

In view of facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find any merit in the present bail application.

Accordingly, present bail application filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail is hereby dismissed.

The observations made herein shall not have any effect on the merit of case.

The bail application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to all concerned.

(Virender Kumar Kharta)
ASJ/FTC-02(CENTRAL)
TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI :03.02.2026