

ITEM NO.31

COURT NO.7

SECTION II-D

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SPetition for Special Leave to Appeal (Cr1.) No.2395/2026[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 10-10-2025
in BA No. 2565/2025 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

AVIATION SERVICE LLC

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

Respondent(s)

[TO BE TAKEN UP TOP OF THE BOARD]

WITH

SLP(Cr1) No. 4361/2026 (II-D)

(IA No. 76127/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT)

SLP(Cr1) No. 5175/2026 (II-D)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(Cr1) No. 5648/2026 (II-D)

(FOR ADMISSION)

Date : 22-04-2026 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Singh, AOR

Mr. Rajeev Kumar Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Sudip Lodh, Adv.

Mr. Neeraj Agarwal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

Mr. Anilendra Pandey, AOR

Mr. Deepak Kohli, Adv.

Ms. Aarati Sah, Adv.

Mr. Rajeev Kumar Ranjan, Adv.

Mr. Brijendr Chahar, A.S.G.

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR

Ms. Pooja Chahar, Adv.

Mr. Amit Sharma-B, Adv.

Mr. Pankaj Singh, Adv.

Mr. Garvil Singh, Adv.

Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, Adv.
Mr. Amrendra Kumar Mehta, AOR
Dr. (Maj) Raj Kishor Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Shweta Singh, Adv.
Mr. Sanjeet Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Shiv Chopra, Adv.
Ms. Mehvish Khan, Adv.
Mr. Adarash Lohia, Adv.

Mr. Vijay Datt Gahtori, Adv.
Mr. Lokesh Kumar Choudhary, AOR
Mr. Ashok Kumar Arya, Adv.
Mr. Akhil Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Zeeshan Khan, Adv.
Mr. Amit, Adv.
Mr. Sri Srirama Chandra Sahu, Adv.
Mr. Rishabh Rai, Adv.

Mr. Anant Gautam, AOR
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gautam, Adv.
Mr. Bhumit Solanki, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Since the issues raised in all the captioned petitions are the same and the respondents in all the captioned petitions are co-accused, those were taken up for hearing analogously and are being disposed of by this common order.
2. It appears from the materials on record that one of the accused persons was granted anticipatory bail by the High Court. Being, dissatisfied with the grant of anticipatory bail, the de facto complainant has come before this Court seeking to challenge the same.
3. Insofar as the other accused are concerned, they all were ordered to be released on anticipatory bail by the Sessions Court.
4. Being, dissatisfied with the order passed by the Sessions Court, the de facto complainant went before the High Court for cancellation of anticipatory bail.
5. The High Court declined to interfere.
6. In such circumstances, the de facto complainant is here before us.
7. We heard the learned counsel appearing for the de facto complainant, the learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for

the Economic Offences Wing (EOW) and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents - accused.

8. We are informed that the investigation is almost complete. The EOW is likely to file charge-sheet in near future. We are further informed that each of the accused persons appeared before the Investigating Agency and joined the investigation.

9. At this point of time, we find no good ground to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the accused persons.

10. If the de facto complainant has any grievance to redress as regards deficiency in the investigation undertaken by the EOW, it shall be open for them to avail appropriate legal remedy before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

11. With the aforesaid, these petitions stand disposed of.

12. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(VISHAL ANAND)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)