



\$~14

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4724/2025 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 2408/2025**

**JAGJIT SINGH @ JAGGA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Sr. Adv. with  
Mr. Sidhant Kumar, Ms. Megha Karnwal,  
Mr. Manu Gupta, Mr. Naman and Ms. Shagun  
Chopra, Advs.

versus

**CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION** .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anupam S. Sharma, SPP

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**ORDER**

%

**19.12.2025**

1. The present application has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No. RC2162025A0014 dated 10.11.2025 registered by CBI, AC-I, New Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 7A, 8 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (hereinafter "PC Act") and Section 61(2) read with Section 204 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The petitioner, arrayed as accused no. 5, was arrested on 10.11.2025 and has remained in custody since then. His first bail application was rejected by the learned Special Judge (PC Act), Rouse Avenue Courts, New Delhi vide order dated 27.11.2025. As per the FIR, the CBI/respondent received an information alleging that accused no. 1 Ajit Kumar Patra, along with accused no. 2 Minku Lal Jain, was impersonating senior government



functionaries and dishonestly inducing persons to part with money by promising to influence public servants. On 04.11.2025, a raid was conducted by DGGI, Jaipur at the office of accused no. 4 Vinod Parihar. It is alleged that accused nos. 1 and 2 assured accused no. 4 that the matter would be “settled” upon payment of Rs. 18 lakhs.

**3.** As per the prosecution version, part of the alleged amount was handed over in Jaipur to one Mohammed Younis, stated to be associated with accused no. 3 Gurjinder Singh Gill. The FIR records that the money was thereafter routed to Delhi through hawala and was allegedly received by one Ismail, stated to be an employee of the present petitioner.

**4.** It is alleged that on 06.11.2025, Rs. 13 lakhs were received in Delhi and that the petitioner acknowledged receipt of this amount. The FIR further states that on 10.11.2025, the petitioner along with Ismail went to the residence of accused No. 1 in Dwarka. Ismail was allegedly carrying a black bag when entering the premises and the bag appeared empty upon exit. On this basis, the prosecution alleges that Rs. 18 lakhs were delivered to accused nos. 1 and 2 for the purpose of bribing public servants. The petitioner was arrested the same day.

**5.** It is an admitted position on record that no money was recovered from the petitioner at the time of arrest and that the recovery of cash was affected from the residence of accused no. 1.

**6.** Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, learned senior counsel and Mr. Siddhant Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the very foundation of the offences under the PC Act is missing in the present case, as there is no allegation of demand or acceptance of bribe by any identified public servant. It is contended that no public servant is named



in the FIR, nor is any role attributed even to an unnamed public servant. Further, the petitioner is alleged only to have delivered cash. There is no material to show that the petitioner had any knowledge that the money was bribe money or that it was intended for influencing public servants. Moreover, neither any evidence nor any allegation has been brought on record to show that the petitioner was part of the main conspiracy as alleged against Ajit Kumar Patra or Vinod Parihar of impersonating public officials, offering inducements and payment of bribes.

**7.** It is submitted that the entire factual narrative in the FIR pertains to alleged assurances given by accused nos. 1 and 2, who are private persons, to accused no. 4, also a private individual. The petitioner is not alleged to have had any interaction with any public servant, nor is it alleged that he represented himself as one or claimed any proximity to one.

**8.** The FIR records that on 06.11.2025, one Ismail allegedly received Rs. 13 lakhs in Delhi on behalf of the petitioner and that the petitioner acknowledged receipt of the said amount. It is submitted that there is no allegation that, at this stage, the petitioner was informed that the money constituted bribe or illegal gratification.

**9.** It is specifically argued that accused no. 3 Gurjinder Singh Gill, who is stated to be the link between the alleged bribe giver and the petitioner, has not been apprehended. It is pertinent to mention that Gurjinder Singh Gill is similarly placed with the petitioner. Similarly, Mohammed Younis, who allegedly received money in Jaipur, and Ismail, who allegedly received money in Delhi, have not been named as accused nor arrested. This, according to learned counsel, creates a serious break in the alleged chain of conspiracy.



**10.** Learned counsel further submits that the prosecution case suffers from material inconsistencies. While the FIR records that Rs. 13 lakhs were received by or on behalf of the petitioner, the allegation on 10.11.2025 is of delivery of Rs. 18 lakhs. No explanation has been placed on record regarding the source or movement of the remaining amount.

**11.** It is contended that there is no recovery of any tainted money from the petitioner. The alleged recovery of cash has been affected from the residence of accused no. 1. No trap proceedings resulted in recovery from the petitioner, nor any other corroborative trap evidence exists against him.

**12.** Learned counsel submits that the FIR contains only a speculative assertion that the black bag carried by Ismail was full when entering the premises and appeared empty upon exit. There is no corroborating material to the effect to conclusively establish that the petitioner delivered any cash to accused nos. 1 or 2.

**13.** It is further argued that the total recovery from accused nos. 1 and 2 is stated to be in excess of Rs. 2.89 crores, thereby rendering it uncertain whether any part of such recovered amount can be attributed to the petitioner at all.

**14.** On the aspect of investigation, it is submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is no longer required. His mobile phone has been seized, voice samples have been taken, and he has cooperated at every stage. The status report itself records completion of these investigative steps *qua* the petitioner.

**15.** Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, is a permanent resident of Delhi, and is engaged in lawful business. The apprehension of tampering with evidence or influencing



witnesses is a mere conjecture and unsupported by any material. It is finally submitted that continued incarceration of the petitioner would amount to pre-trial punishment, especially when the prosecution case against him rests on circumstantial and inferential allegations which are yet to be tested at trial. Thus, it is prayed that the instant application may be allowed and the reliefs be granted as prayed for.

**16.** *Per Contra*, Mr. Anupam Sharma, learned SPP appearing on behalf of the CBI opposes the application and submits that the case reveals a wider conspiracy involving impersonation of public officials and payment of illegal gratification to influence public servants. It is argued that the petitioner acted as a *hawala* conduit and played a crucial role in transferring bribe money.

**17.** Learned counsel relies upon the allegations in the FIR to submit that the petitioner acknowledged receipt of Rs. 13 lakhs and thereafter actively sought the delivery location for handing over the money on 10.11.2025. This conduct, according to the prosecution, demonstrates conscious involvement. It is further submitted that the petitioner was apprehended during a trap operation. The prosecution contends that the petitioner, along with Ismail, was seen entering the residence of accused no. 1 with a black bag and exiting shortly thereafter with the bag appearing empty, which shows that the money was delivered inside.

**18.** Learned counsel submits that the intercepted conversations form an important link in establishing the conspiracy and the role of each accused, including the petitioner. It is argued that the recorded conversations, when read cumulatively with other material, indicate coordination between the accused persons for transfer and delivery of illegal gratification. Learned



counsel submits that the petitioner's telephonic communications show his involvement in receiving instructions regarding the delivery of money and in coordinating the timing and location of such delivery.

**19.** Learned counsel submits that the investigation is still at a nascent stage. Multiple accused are involved, including persons not yet apprehended, and the financial trail is being examined through CDRs, intercepted communications, and banking channels. It is contended that the petitioner's release may result in coordination with other accused or potential witnesses, particularly those involved in the alleged *hawala* transactions, thereby affecting the integrity of the investigation.

**20.** It is further submitted that corruption is a serious offence affecting society at large and that the gravity of the allegations must weigh against grant of bail. Accordingly, it is prayed that the instant application may be dismissed being devoid of any merits.

**21.** In rejoinder, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the prosecution's reliance on intercepted or recorded conversations does not advance the case against the petitioner, as nothing has been disclosed in connection with the main conspiracy. Learned counsel points out that the FIR and the status report do not attribute any specific conversation to the petitioner wherein he acknowledges that the money being transferred was bribe money or was intended to influence any public servant. Further, voice samples of the petitioner have been already taken.

**22.** Heard the parties and perused the material on record.

**23.** At the stage of consideration of bail, this Court is not required to conduct a detailed examination of evidence. The focus is rather on the nature of accusations, the role attributed to the accused, the requirement of



custodial interrogation, and the well-settled triple test of flight risk, tampering with evidence, and influencing witnesses prescribed under Section 483 BNSS.

**24.** At the outset, it is noted that in the present case, the petitioner (accused no. 5), along with accused nos. 1 and 2, has been arrested and has remained in custody since 10.11.2025. However, other individuals who, as per the FIR itself, occupy crucial positions in the alleged chain of events, have not been apprehended till date.

**25.** Accused no. 3 Gurjinder Singh Gill, who is alleged to have facilitated the routing of money from Jaipur to Delhi, and against whom the allegations are similar to that of the petitioner, is not arrested and allowed to join the investigation.

**26.** Similarly, Mohammed Younis, who is stated to have received the money in Jaipur, and Ismail, who allegedly received the money in Delhi and was accompanying the petitioner on 10.11.2025, have neither been named as accused nor arrested, despite being central to the prosecution narrative.

**27.** This selective arrest assumes significance at the stage of bail, particularly when the role attributed to the petitioner is that of an alleged carrier or conduit of money. The prosecution has not placed any material to explain why custodial interrogation of the petitioner alone was indispensable, while the similarly placed accused person, who directly handled the money at earlier stages was not subjected to similar action, rather he was given an opportunity join the investigation.

**28.** In the present case, the element of recovery from the petitioner is absent. The money was not recovered from his possession but from the



premises of another accused. The role attributed to the petitioner is that of a carrier or conduit and not that he is part of the main conspiracy, as alleged against Ajit Kumar Patra or Vinod Parihar of impersonating public officials, offering inducements and payment of bribes. Whether such role, in the absence of knowledge or intent, would attract the rigors of the PC Act is a matter for trial. At this stage, the material does not disclose a clear *prima facie* case of conscious involvement in the main conspiracy.

**29.** In the absence of any recovery from the petitioner and in light of the fact that key alleged links in the chain of events remain at large, as well as the fact that the allegations against the petitioner are that of a facilitator and do not pertain to the main conspiracy, continued incarceration of the petitioner cannot be justified solely on the ground that investigation is pending.

**30.** The inconsistencies regarding the amount allegedly received and delivered, coupled with the absence of recovery from the petitioner, do weigh in favor of the petitioner as the same brings in an element of uncertainty which cannot be ignored at the stage of bail.

**31.** The petitioner has remained in custody since 10.11.2025 and it is stated by the learned SPP for the CBI that the same is likely to be filed soon. Further, petitioner's voice samples have been taken, and his mobile phone has already been seized. The prosecution has thus not demonstrated any specific investigative requirement that necessitates his continued detention other than the fact that the investigation is still pending in light of the fact that no role is attributed to him other than being a person responsible for handing over money to the main accused (hawala operator).



**32.** The Court has considered the rival submissions with regard to the intercepted conversations relied upon by the prosecution. Upon Court's query, the prosecution was unable to showcase any specific recorded conversation *qua* the petitioner in connection with his role in the main conspiracy, as alleged against Ajit Kumar Patra or Vinod Parihar of impersonating public officials, offering inducements and payment of bribes.

**33.** In the present case, while the CBI asserts that the intercepted conversations indicate coordination for transfer and delivery of illegal gratification, neither the FIR nor the status report places on record any specific conversation wherein the petitioner is shown to have demanded, negotiated, or accepted a bribe, or to have acknowledged that the money allegedly handled by him was intended to influence a public servant.

**34.** In these circumstances, the intercepted conversations, though relied upon by the prosecution, do not, at this stage, furnish a sufficient *prima facie* basis to justify continued incarceration of the petitioner.

**35.** Applying these principles, this Court is of the view that continued incarceration of the petitioner is not warranted at this stage of investigation. The petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail in the present FIR, upon him furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹50,000/- with two solvent sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Duty Judge, subject to the following conditions:

- a. The petitioner shall not leave the National Capital Territory of Delhi without prior permission of the Court concerned;
- b. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer;



- c. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly influence any witness or tamper with evidence; and
- d. The petitioner shall provide his mobile number and address to the Investigating Officer and keep it operational at all times.

**36.** It is clarified that the observations made herein are for the limited purpose of deciding the present bail application and shall not influence the trial on merits.

**37.** Accordingly, the instant bail application is allowed. The present bail application stands disposed of along with the pending application(s), if any.

**AJAY DIGPAUL, J**

**DECEMBER 19, 2025/gs/ryp**