

**Bail Matter - 26/2026
FIR No. RC0032026A0002
PS CBI, ACB, New Delhi
U/S 61(2) of BNS 2023 r/w
Section 7 of PC Act, 1988
(as amended in 2018)
CBI vs Ravinder Dabas & Ors.**

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rahul Raheja & Sh. Gaurav Prakash,
Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused Pankaj Kumar
Yadav.
Sh. Tajvinder Singh, Ld.PP, CBI with IO/Dy.SP
Anmol Sachan.
Reply to the bail application of applicant/accused
Pankaj Kumar Yadav filed by CBI. Copy given.
Arguments heard on the bail application.

ORDER

- (1) The facts in brief are that the present FIR was registered by CBI, ACB, New Delhi on 07.01.2026 on the basis of the complaint dated 31.12.2025. It was alleged in the said complaint that the complainant Sh. Dharmendra Gupta, who was working as Advocate in Delhi and also doing the work related to registry of sale deed etc., had some sale deed/ registry pertaining to his clients pending at the office of Sub-Registrar-I, Kashmiri Gate, Central Delhi and the same were to be received by him from the said office. It was alleged that on 30.12.2025, Sh. Sunil, Sh. Nitin, Sh. Dabas (Reader) and Sub-Registrar-I had

demanded bribe amount of Rs.10,000/- in lieu of providing his clients' sale deed/registry, to the complainant. They also threatened that if the demanded amount was not paid, then his client's documents/ sale deed would be objected by embossing with red seal of MCD and by sending them to MCD. As the complainant did not want to pay any bribe to Sh. Sunil, Sh. Nitin, Sh.Dabas (Reader) and Sub-Registrar-I, he lodged a complaint to SP, CBI, ACB, New Delhi, for taking legal action against them.

- (2) The said complaint was marked to Sh. Dharam Bir, Inspector, CBI, ACB, Delhi for verification and report. He conducted the verification in the presence of independent witness. The verification had prima facie revealed that accused persons namely Dabas (later identified as Ravinder Dabas), Reader to SR, Sunil, Nitin (later identified as Aashish Kumar) and unknown others had demanded bribe of Rs.10,000/-.
- (3) Then the investigation of the case was entrusted to Inspector Ravinder Kumar Bharti, CBI, ACB, Delhi for investigation.
- (4) During the course of investigation, complainant arranged an amount of Rs.10,000/-, on 07.01.2026 and a trap was laid wherein accused Aashish Kumar @ Nitin was caught red handed while demanding and accepting a bribe amount of Rs.10,000/- from the complainant.
- (5) It was revealed that accused Aashish Kumar in criminal conspiracy with other co-accused persons namely

Pankaj Kumar Yadav (Sub-Registrar-I), Ravinder Dabas, Reader, Sunil Kumar (private person) had accepted the demanded bribe amount of Rs.10,000/- from the complainant. Later, the said tainted bribe amount of Rs.10,000/- was recovered from the possession of accused Aashish Kumar. All the four accused persons named above, were arrested on 08.01.2026 and are presently in J/c.

- (6) In the present bail application, it is stated that the applicant/accused Pankaj Kumar Yadav has been falsely implicated and has no role whatsoever in the alleged demand or acceptance of illegal gratification. There is no direct evidence linking the applicant/accused with the alleged offence.
- (7) Further, no recovery of any bribe amount has been effected from the applicant/accused and rather, the entire recovery is from co-accused Aashish Kumar who was apprehended during the trap. Infact, the initial verification report, which forms the foundation of registration of present FIR, does not name or attribute any role to the applicant/accused. There is no evidence to suggest that the said amount of Rs.10,000/- was ever intended for or was passed on to the applicant/accused.
- (8) It is further stated that mere official position or supervisory role cannot give rise to presumption of guilt. The implication of the applicant/accused is solely on

alleged inference and imputed role arising out of his designation as Sub-Registrar.

(9) It is further stated that the applicant/accused is a permanent resident and a govt. servant with a fixed place of posting. So, there is no apprehension of him absconding or evading trial. Further, there is no likelihood of applicant/accused tampering with the evidence or influencing witnesses.

(10) It is further submitted that co-accused Ravinder Dabas, who was apprehended from the Office of Sub-Registrar and against whom specific allegations were levelled, has already been granted bail by this court vide its order dated 22.01.2026. The role attributed to applicant/accused is not graver or distinguishable from that of the said co-accused and rather, the applicant/accused stands on a better footing. So, the applicant/accused is entitled to grant of bail even on the grounds of parity. Prayer is accordingly made for grant of bail.

(11) In the reply filed by IO, CBI, the allegations levelled against the accused persons including the applicant/accused has been reiterated that he had conspired with other accused persons and in furtherance of the said conspiracy, demanded and accepted undue pecuniary advantage of Rs.10,000/- from the complainant through co-accused Ashish Kumar @ Nitin for releasing the registered deed of his client.

(12) It is further stated that every act or the conduct of a public servant should be to effectuate the public purpose and constitutional objective. It is further stated that an accused person may incur criminal liability in respect of an offence in various ways such as, he may personally commit if, he may participate in its commission though he does not act himself, he may set some other to work with a view to the commission of the offence or he may help the offender after the act with a view to screening him from justice. In the instant case, role of applicant/accused has been established during trap proceedings. Further, the co-accused private persons have demanded the bribe from the complainant, which was on the behest of applicant/accused. Prayer is accordingly made to dismiss the bail application.

(13) I have heard arguments from both sides and have perused the record.

(14) From the reply filed today, it appears that investigation qua the applicant/ accused is substantially completed. Some more evidence may be required to be collected by the IO, for which further incarceration of applicant/accused appears to be unnecessary. The applicant/accused has already been in J/c for more than 15 days and his further custody appears to be unwarranted. Moreover, co-accused Ravinder Dabas has already been granted bail by this court on similar facts vide its order

dated 22.01.2026. So, even on the ground of parity, the applicant/accused is entitled to bail.

- (15) Considering all the above facts & circumstances, the applicant/accused Pankaj Kumar Yadav is admitted to bail on furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with one surety of like amount with direction that he shall join investigation and shall not tamper with evidence or influence the witnesses in any manner whatsoever. Accused shall also not leave the country without prior permission of this court.
- (16) Bail application stands disposed off accordingly.
- (17) Further, in order to ensure that such instances do not get repeated in future, the Appropriate Authority, Govt. of NCT of Delhi should ensure that the applicant/accused Pankaj Kumar Yadav is restrained from visiting the same office of Sub Registrar, Kashmere Gate.
- (18) Copy of the order be given dasti to both the parties, as requested.

(Atul Krishna Agrawal)
Special Judge, CBI-19 (PC Act)
RADC/New Delhi/29.01.2026