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

RESERVED ON : 10th APRIL, 2017
DECIDED ON : 05th MAY, 2017

\+   **BAIL APPLN. 119/2017 & CRL.M.B. 121/2017**

ROHIT TANDON ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr.Vikas Pahwa, Sr.Advocate & Mr.Vivek Sood, Sr.Advocate with Mr.Arunabh Chawdhary, Mr.Amit Sharma, Mr.Vaibhav Tomar & Ms.Kinnore Ghosh, Advocates.

VERSUS

ENFORCEMENT DIRECTORATE ..... Respondent

Through : Mr.Sanjay Jain, ASG with Mr.Amit Mahajan, CGSC, Ms.Karnika Singh, Ms.A.Thakur & Mr.V.Pasayat, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P.GARG

S.P.GARG, J.

1. The petitioner seeks regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case ECIR/18/DZ-II/2016/AD (RV) registered under Sections 3 & 4 of Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred as ‘PMLA’). Status report is on record.

2. I have heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and learned Addl. Solicitor General and have examined the file.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner urged that the petitioner is in custody since 28.12.2016. He has joined the investigation on various dates. The petitioner a practicing lawyer for nearly 35 years belongs

to a respectable family. It is urged that petitioner's arrest is premature as the offences under Sections 420/406/409/467/468/471/188/120-B IPC alleged in FIR No.205/2016 PS Crime Branch have not been prima facie established; no charge-sheet till date has been filed and the investigation is still at preliminary stage. The petitioner was not named therein; he was never asked to join the investigation in the said proceedings. Enforcement Directorate (hereinafter referred as 'ED') can't conduct investigation before the Crime Branch concludes its investigation in the FIR No.205/2016 as the 'scheduled offence' requires to be proved before attracting provisions of PMLA. Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that Sections 3 & 4 of PMLA are not attracted and an individual can be arraigned as an accused under PMLA only if 'scheduled offence' as defined in the PMLA is committed and the proceeds obtained from the criminal activity relating to such 'scheduled offence' is being laundered to make it legal or to take the benefit of the same. It is imperative for the investigating agency to ascertain that first the 'scheduled offences' are prima facie, proven or accepted to have been committed without any reasonable apprehension of doubt.

4. Learned Senior Counsel would urge that the petitioner's arrest is wholly unjustified and unwarranted being violative of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. No trial under Sections 3 & 4 of PMLA can proceed without a charge-sheet being filed in the case emanating from FIR No.205/2016 PS Crime Branch. Section 44 of the Act as amended in 2013 contemplates 'joint trial' by a Special Court in case of 'scheduled offence' and offence under PMLA, to avoid conflicting and multiple opinions of courts. In the instant case, when the charge-sheet in the 'scheduled offence'

is yet to be filed, trial against the petitioner under PMLA cannot commence or continue.

5. Relying upon '*Gurcharan Singh vs. Union of India',* 2016 SCC OnLine Delhi 2493, Senior Counsel urged that, prima facie, offences under PMLA are non-cognizable in terms of the amendment carried out in the year 2005. It is further argued that allegations contained in FIR No.205/2016 and the ECIR/18 do not constitute violation of the Demonetization Policy of the Government of India and acts of deposit of cash of ₹38.53 crores and preparation of Demand Drafts, which were never encashed, are permissible under Section, 2(iii) and 2(vii) of Demonetization Policy. The said Notification does not attract any criminal charges for holding old notes in huge denominations. These sections permit unlimited deposit of old currency in the bank account and there are no restrictions in the use of banking transactions. It was further urged that the ED has no jurisdiction to investigate the instant case; only Delhi Police is competent to do so. Role of ED as an investigating agency comes into play only when a 'scheduled offence' is prima facie made out and 'proceeds of crime' as defined under Section 2(u) of PMLA have been identified and have been used to launder money. Most of the actions mentioned in the FIR attract tax implications and the appropriate authority to investigate the matter is Income Tax Department and not ED.

6. Reliance has been placed on '*Sushil Kumar Katiyar vs. Union of India & Ors.*', MANU/UP/0777/2016; '*Gurucharan Singh vs. Union of India*', SLP (Crl.) No.19020-19022/2016; '*Rakesh Manekchand Kothari vs. Union of India*', Special Crl. Application (Habeas Corpus) No.4247/2015 decided on 03.08.2015; '*Ranjitsing Brahmajeetsing Sharma vs. State of*

Maharashtra & Anr.', 2005 (5) SCC 294; '*Usmanbhai Dawoodbhai Memon vs. State of Gujarat*', 1988 SCC 271; '*State of Uttaranchal vs. Rajesh Kumar Gupta*', 2007 (1) SCC 355; '*Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar & Anr.*', 2014 (8) SCC 273, & '*Sanjay Chandra vs. Central Bureau of Investigation*', 2012 (1) SCC 40.

7. Learned Addl. Solicitor General refuting the contentions urged that the ED has no role to play in the investigation of the offences in FIR No.205/2016 lodged by the police of Police Station Crime Branch; it is not concerned with the outcome in the said investigation. For the purpose of starting investigation by ED for commission of the offences under PMLA, only criminal complaint or FIR in respect of allegations for 'scheduled offence' is required. After the initiation of the investigation under PMLA, the proceedings are totally independent and distinct from the proceedings of the 'scheduled offence'. The petitioner was arrested only on the basis of the material in his possession by the Investigating Officer for commission of offence punishable under Sections 3 & 4 of the PMLA. Complaint under Section 45 PMLA has already been filed against the petitioner and others and the learned Special Judge has taken cognizance. Learned Addl. Solicitor General further urged that Section 4 of PMLA read with Second part of the First Schedule of the Cr.P.C. makes it absolutely clear that the offence of money laundering is cognizable and non-bailable. The investigation and arrest have been carried out following due procedure and guidelines laid down in the PMLA which is a self-contained Code having separate provisions for arrest, search and seizure, attachment, confiscation, investigation and prosecution, etc. Learned Addl. Solicitor General further urged that allegations against the petitioner are serious. After

commencement of Demonetization Policy on 08.11.2016, the petitioner hatched a criminal conspiracy to get such demonetized currency exchanged into monetized form on commission basis. The petitioner is the master-mind and beneficiary of the entire transactions. At his instance, entire money running into crores of rupees was deposited into various accounts and Demand Drafts were made in fictitious names for encashment in future. During investigation under PMLA, statements of accounts of various companies i.e. namely Delhi Trading Company, Kwality Trading Company, Mahalaxmi Industries, R.K.International, Sapna Trading Company, Shree Ganesh Enterprises, Swastik Trading Company and Virgo International (herein referred to 'Group of Companies') were analysed and scrutinized. One more additional account of Delhi Trading Company was also identified as related to Raj Kumar Goel where in similar transactions took place. During investigation, statements of various persons including Ashish Kumar, Raj Kumar Goel, Kamal Jain, C.A., Dinesh Bhola have been recorded under Section 50 PMLA. Call Data Records of the associated persons were collected and analyzed. It emerged therefrom that several persons were involved in deep-rooted racket to convert the demonetized currency into monetized currency by depositing the demonetized cash into various accounts of such firms where cash in hand was available in books of accounts. Later Demand Drafts were issued in fictitious names which were intended to be cancelled.

8. It revealed that from 15.11.2016 to 19.11.2016 there was huge cash deposit of ₹31.75 crores by Raj Kumar Goel and his associates and incoming RTGS was to the tune of ₹6.86 crores. Demand Drafts amounting to ₹38 crores were issued in fictitious names i.e. Sunil Kumar, Dinesh

Kumar,Abhilasha Dubey, Madan Kumar, Madan Saini, Satya Narain Dagdi and Seema Bai. Total cash (demonetized currency of ₹31.75 crores) was deposited in eight accounts of Kotak Mahindra Bank during 15.11.2016 to 19.11.2016 with RTGS inwards to the tune of ₹6.86 crores. During the said period, 75 Demand Drafts to the tune of ₹39.64 crores were issued from the said accounts; out of which three demand drafts of ₹1.11 crores were cancelled. Demand Drafts issued from Kotak Mahindra Bank amounting to ₹34.88 crores were recovered. Demand drafts amounting to ₹3.12 crores all dated 15.11.2016 issued by ICICI bank and Bank of Baroda have also been recovered. The funds actually pertaining to the petitioner were carefully distanced away from him through a calibrated planning. The collection of cash (demonetized currency) was used to be done through meetings at different dates with the petitioner and his associates Ashish Kumar, Dinesh Bhola and Raj Kumar during 14.11.2016 to 19.11.2016. The demonetized cash used to be taken over by Ashish Kumar and Raj Kumar Goel and others. Demand Drafts were used to be handed over by Ashish Kumar to Dinesh Bhola. Raj Kumar Goel used to bring such cash and deposit the same with Kotak Mahindra Bank with active assistance of Ashish Kumar, Branch Manager as is evident from CCTV footage of the bank. It is further urged that on 14.11.2016 Ashish Kumar visited petitioner's office at R-89 GK-I where he took from Dinesh Bhola about ₹1.5 crores as token of advance to start the work. The other transactions were done twice in T and T farmhouse (Petitioner's farm house); two times in a street adjacent to the farm house and the last transaction in the petitioner's office at R-89, GK-I. In all these transactions, Dinesh Bhola acting on petitioner's instructions handed over the demonetized cash to Ashish Kumar and others. It is further

urged that the properties involved in money laundering totaling about ₹41.65 crores have surfaced during investigation so far and these have been attached vide Attachment Order No.03/2017 dated 13.02.2017.

9. Learned Addl. Solicitor General urged that the statements recorded under Section 50 PMLA have evidentiary value. Statements of various individuals recorded under Section 50 confirm that money in old currency pertained to the petitioner and the conspiracy was executed on his instructions.

10. Admitted position is that prior to registration of ECIR No. 18 dated 26.12.2016 by the ED for investigation, Crime Branch of Delhi Police had already registered FIR No.205/2016 under Sections 420/406/409/467/468/188/120B IPC on 25.12.2016 against Ashish Kumar, Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Connaught Place; Raj Kumar Goel and certain other persons. It is not in dispute that the offences mentioned in FIR No.205/2016 are 'scheduled offences', prima facie, giving jurisdiction to ED to carry out investigation under Sections 3 & 4 of PMLA. Presence of 'scheduled offence' is only a trigger point for initiating investigation under PMLA, 2002. The Act nowhere prescribes if ED is debarred from conducting investigation under Sections 3 & 4 PMLA unless the investigating agency concludes its investigation in the FIR or charge-sheet is filed therein for commission of 'scheduled offence'. The proceedings under PMLA are distinct from the proceedings of the 'scheduled offence'. In the investigation of FIR No.205/2016 lodged by Crime Branch of Delhi Police, ED has no control. The proceedings under PMLA are not dependent on the outcome of the investigation conducted in the 'scheduled offences'. It is relevant to note that FIR No.205/2016 was lodged on 25.12.2016 and the

matter is still under investigation. The petitioner has not been exonerated in the said proceedings as no charge-sheet has so far been filed. It is true that under Section 44 of PMLA, to avoid conflicting and multiple opinions of the Court, there is a provision of trial by a Special Court in case of 'scheduled offence' and offence under PMLA. Possibility of joint trial would arise under Section 44 of PMLA only when charge-sheet is filed upon completion of investigation in case FIR No.205/2016 and the case is committed to the Special Court. Section 44 does not talk of joint investigation or joint trial. It makes it mandatory that the offence punishable under Section 4 of the Act and any scheduled offence connected to the offence under that section shall be triable only by Special Court constituted for the area in which the offence has been committed.

11. Section 44 PMLA reads as under :

> *"(a) an offence punishable under section 4 and any scheduled offence connected to the offence under that section shall be triable by the Special Court constituted for the area in which the offence has been committed.*
> *Provided that the Special Court, trying a scheduled offence before the commencement of this Act, shall continue to try such scheduled offence; or*
> *(b) a Special Court may, upon a complaint made by an authority authorised in this behalf under this Act take [cognizance of offence under section 3, without the accused being committed to it for trial].*

> *(c) if the court which has taken cognizance of the scheduled offence is other than the Special Court which has taken cognizance of the complaint of the offence of money-laundering under sub-clause (b), it shall, on an application by the authority authorized to file a complaint under this Act, commit the case relating to the scheduled offence to the Special Court and the Special Court shall, on receipt of such case proceed to deal with it from the stage at which it is committed.*
> *(d) a Special Court while trying the scheduled offence or the offence of money-laundering shall hold trial in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), as it applies to a trial before a Court of Session.*"
> (Emphasis given)

12. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner was unable to show any precedent to buttress his contention that in the absence of filing of the charge-sheet in the 'scheduled offence', the proceedings under PMLA cannot be initiated or investigated. In '*Sushil Kumar Katiyar vs. Union of India and Others*', MANU/UP/0777/2016, relied upon by the petitioner, the High Court of Allahabad observed :

> *"36. In this regard, I have examined the various case laws cited by the petitioner as well as the opposite parties and the legal position which emerges out after study of the various*

case laws, is that a person can be prosecuted for the offence of money laundering even if he is not guilty of scheduled offences and his property can also be provisionally attached irrespective of the fact as to whether he has been found guilty of the scheduled offences. The prosecution is not required to wait for the result of the conviction for the scheduled offences in order to initiate proceedings under Section 3 of the PML Act. However, the person against whom there is an allegation of the offence of money laundering, can approach appropriate forum in order to show his bonafide and innocence that he is not guilty of the offence of money laundering and has not acquired any proceeds of crime or any property out of the proceeds of crime. The opposite parties had challenged the order of discharge before this Court but this Court has upheld the order of discharge passed by the trial Court. The said order has become final."

(Emphasis given)

13. More so in *Sushil Kumar Katiyar's case* (supra), the complaint under Section 45 PMLA was filed for commission of offences under Sections 3 & 4 of PMLA only after the petitioner therein had been discharged from all the 'schedule offences' on merits by the courts of competent jurisdiction. The discharge order was upheld by the High Court and had attained finality.

14. In FIR No.205/2016 allegations are that Raj Kumar Goel; Ashish Kumar, Bank Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, K.G.Marg Branch and others conspired for illegal conversion of demonetized currency notes into monetized currency by way of depositing cash in various accounts of the firms and subsequently getting Demand Drafts issued in fictitious names. It is further alleged in the said FIR that accused therein opened bank accounts in the name of 'Group of Companies' in Kotak Mahindra Bank. In ECIR No.18, transactions statements of accounts were collected pertaining to these 'Group of Companies' from Kotak Mahindra Bank and it emerged that from 15.11.2016 to 19.11.2016, there was huge cash deposit to the tune of ₹31.75 crores by Raj Kumar Goel and his associates. It was also found that the Demand Drafts amounting to ₹38 crores were issued in fictitious names during that period. It cannot be said at this stage that offences referred in FIR No.205/2016 and the ECIR No.18 have no nexus.

15. Prosecution under Section 45 of PMLA for commission of offence under Section 3 punishable under Section 4 of PMLA has already been initiated by ED in the Special Court. By an order dated 25.02.2017, learned Addl. Sessions Judge / Special Court (PMLA) has taken cognizance against Rohit Tandon (present petitioner), Ashish Kumar and Raj Kumar Goel. Dinesh Bhola and Kamal Jain have also been summoned to face trial under Section 4 of PMLA. Raj Kumar Goel and Ashish Kumar continue to be in custody in the said proceedings.

16. On perusal of the complaint lodged under Section 45 PMLA, it reveals that serious and grave allegations have been leveled against the petitioner and others. The allegations are categorical and specific; definite role has been assigned to each accused. It is alleged that during the period

from 15.11.2016 to 19.11.2016, huge cash to the tune of ₹31.75 crores was deposited in eight bank accounts in Kotak Mahindra Bank in the accounts of the 'Group of Companies'. It gives details of Demand Drafts issued during 15.11.2016 to 19.11.2016 from eight bank accounts in the name of Sunil Kumar, Dinesh Kumar, Abhilasha Dubey, Madan Kumar, Madan Saini, Satya Narain Dagdi and Seema Bai on various dates. Most of the Demand Drafts issued have since been recovered. Its detail finds mention in Table No.2 given in the complaint.

17. During arguments, specific query was raised and the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner was asked as to, to whom the money deposited in the various accounts belonged. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner was fair enough to admit that the whole money belonged to the petitioner. When enquired as to from which 'source', huge cash was procured, there was no clear response to it. Again, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner was asked as to how the cash belonging to the petitioner happened to be deposited in various accounts of the 'Group of Companies' which were not owned by the petitioner and what was its purpose. It was further enquired as to why the Demand Drafts were got issued in the names of the persons referred above and what was its specific purpose. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner avoided to answer these queries stating that the defence of the petitioner could not be disclosed at this juncture to impact his case during trial. Apparently, no plausible explanation has been offered as to what forced the petitioner to deposit the old currency to the tune of ₹31.75 crores in eight accounts of the different 'Group of Companies' in Kotak Mahindra Bank during the short period from 15.11.2016 to 19.11.2016. There was no explanation as to why the Demand Drafts for the

said amount were got issued in the name of sham people whose identity was not known. The purpose of all this exercise seemingly was to deposit the cash (old currency) first, get the Demand Drafts issued in fictitious names and obtain monetized currency by cancelling them subsequently. The petitioner also did not place on record any document whatsoever to show as to from which legal source, the cash was procured to deposit in the bank accounts of strangers. I find no substance in the petitioner's plea that petitioner's only liability was to pay income tax on the unaccounted money / income. In my considered view, mere payment of tax on the unaccounted money from any 'source' whatever would not convert it into 'legal' money. Needless to say, huge deposit was a sinister attempt / strategy by the petitioner and others to convert the 'old currency' into new one to frustrate the Demonetization Policy primarily meant to unearth black money.

18. Allegations against the petitioner are not without substance. The prosecution has recorded statements of the petitioner on various dates and that of Dinesh Bhola, Ashish Kumar (Branch Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank), Raj Kumar Goel, Kamal Jain (petitioner's Chartered Accountant), Vimal Negi, Jivan Singh and Varun Tandon under Section 50 PMLA on various dates. There statements have evidentiary value under Section 50 PMLA. Prima facie, the version given by them is in consonance with the prosecution case. The prosecution has further relied upon Call Data Records, CCTV footage, Account Trend Analysis.

19. Relying upon '*Gurcharan Singh vs. Union of India',* (supra), learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that offences under PMLA are non-cognizable in terms of the amendment carried out in the year 2005. Dealing with this aspect, learned Trial Court observed that the issue

of cognizability of the offence under Section 3 of PMLA is yet to be decided by this Court. It relied upon a judgment '*Chhagan Chandrakant Bhujbal vs. Union of India & Ors.*' bearing Crl.W.P.No.3931/06 decided on 14.12.2016 by Bombay High Court. This Court finds no valid reasons to take a different view from the observations recorded by the Trial Court in para Nos. 17 & 18 of the impugned order. This Court in '*Anand Chauhan vs. Directorate of Enforcement*' while deciding Bail Application 2241/2016 on 10.04.2017 in para No.15 observed :

> *"15. The petitioner further relies upon a Division Bench judgment of this Court in* ***Gurucharan Singh vs. Union of India****, 2016 SCC OnLine Del 2493, wherein the accused was released on bail by the Court in view of the amendment of section 45 PMLA – making it a non-cognizable offence. The Division Bench in* ***Gurucharan Singh*** *(supra) observed that it is mandatory to follow the provisions of Section 155, 177 (1) and 172 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in case the offence is non-cognizable. It was further observed that without reaching the conclusion that the offence under PMLA is cognizable, the respondent was bound to follow and comply with the said provision of the Code of Criminal Procedure. It was further observed that in the absence of the procedure having been followed, the rights of the petitioner under Article 21 of the Constitution stand violated."*

20. Learned ASG Mr.Jain has submitted that the petitioner's arrest was duly made under Section 19 of PMLA as the petitioner had committed the offence of money laundering. Section 19 of PMLA provides that if, on the basis of the material in his possession, the authorized officer has reason to believe that a person is guilty of offence punishable under Section PMLA, he may arrest such person. At the time of taking cognizance, the learned Trial Court had noted that there was sufficient material on record to proceed against the petitioner and others for commission of offence punishable under Section 4 of PMLA.

21. Besides above, Section 45 of PMLA puts stringent conditions for the release of an accused charged under part A of the Schedule on bail. These conditions have overriding effect over the general provisions of Cr.P.C. In *Anand Chauhan's* case (supra) this Court placing reliance upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in '*Gautam Kundu vs. Directorate of Enforcement*', (2015) 16 SCC 1 held :

> *"30. In Gautam Kundu (supra), the Supreme Court has categorically held that the conditions specified in Section 45 of the PMLA are mandatory and needs to be complied with. In this regard, the Supreme Court places reliance on Sections 65 and 71 of PMLA. Section 65 provides that the provisions of the Code shall apply insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the PMLA and Section 71 provides that the provisions of PMLA shall have*

over-riding effect, notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in other law for the time being in force. Thus, PMLA has an over-riding effect and the provisions of the Code would apply only if they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the PMLA. The Supreme Court has held that the compliance of the provisions of Section 45 of the PMLA should be insisted upon by the High Court as well, while considering an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. In the present case, the prima facie finding returned by the trial court with regard to the petitioner's involvement in the scheduled offence is unexceptionable.

31. Reliance placed by learned senior counsel for the petitioner on Gurucharan Singh (supra) is not apposite in the facts of the present case. Firstly, the Division Bench in Gurucharan Singh (supra) was dealing with an application in writ proceedings whereas, in the present case, this Court is only concerned with an application seeking bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. Thus, this Court is considering the present application within the boundaries of Section 45 of the PMLA as laid down in Gautam Kundu (supra). Secondly, in Gurucharan Singh (supra), the petitioner was not an accused in the scheduled offence. However, in the present case, the petitioner is an accused in the FIR/RC registered by

the CBI under Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(e) of the PC Act and Section 109 IPC.

32. Reliance placed by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner on various decisions which deal with the considerations that the Court dealing with a bail application should keep in mind, cannot be pressed into service in view of the expression language of Section 45 of the PMLA and decision of the Supreme Court in Gautam Kundu (supra).

33. No doubt, the Division Bench in writ petition being WP(Crl.) No. 2823/2016 observed that the pendency of the writ petition shall not prevent the petitioner from moving an application to seek bail under the Code, and the said direction was continued vide order dated 07.10.2016, but, the same does not mean that this Court while dealing with the bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. can take into consideration aspects which fall within the realm of writ jurisdiction, and in respect whereof the petitioner's writ petition is pending. This Court is clearly bound by the decision of the Supreme Court in Gautam Kundu (supra)."

22. Antecedents of the petitioner are also to be noted. Undisputedly, the petitioner along with others is also involved in case FIR No.197/2016 registered under Section 420/409/188/120B IPC on 14.12.2016

by Crime Branch and ECIR No.14/DZ-II/2016 registered on 16.12.2016 by ED for the offences under Sections 3/4 PMLA. It is alleged that on 10.12.2016 at around 10.00 p.m., raid was conducted by Crime Branch and Income Tax Department at the petitioner's office premises jointly. It is alleged that during the said raid ₹13.62 crores were recovered which included ₹2.62 of new currency in the ₹2000 denomination. Record reveals that during 06/08.10.2016, there was also income tax raid in the office and residential premises of the petitioner. In the said raid, the petitioner had surrendered about ₹128 crores which related to past investment in his company.

23. It is to be ascertained as to, to whom the huge cash recovered in the present proceedings belonged as there is no reliable or credible document on record to infer if the petitioner has obtained it from any legal / legitimate sources. Possibility of it to be 'proceeds of crime' can't be ruled out.

24. Taking into consideration the serious allegations against the petitioner and other factors including severity of the punishment prescribed in law, I find no sufficient ground to grant bail to the petitioner.

25. The bail application is dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

26. Observations in the order shall have no impact on merits of the case.

(S.P.GARG)
JUDGE

MAY 05, 2017 / *tr*