



2026:DHC:6628



\$~1

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

%

Date of Decision: 13.08.2026# **CNR No. DLHC010130742026**+ **BAIL APPLN. 1283/2026 & CRL.M.A. 10062/2026****MANISH KUMAR THAKKAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sumitra Choudhary, Advocate
(through video conferencing)

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with Investigating Officer/SI Shivam
Malik.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 610/2025 of Police Station Karol Bagh for offence under Section 420/34 IPC.

2. At the outset, learned APP for State points out that the

*BAIL APPLN. 1283/2026**Page 1 of 6 pages***GIRISH
KATHPALIA**Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=JUDICIAL, email=girish.kathpalia@delhihi.org, c=IN
c=IN, email=girish.kathpalia@delhihi.org, ou=JUDICIAL, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Reason: I am the signatory of this document

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: RAHUL YADAV
Signing Date: 13.08.2026
16:58:47



Digitally signed by CN=HIS COURT OF DELHI
DN: cn=hiscourt@delhi.nic.in, o=HIS COURT
OF DELHI, ou=his court of delhi, email=hiscourt@delhi.nic.in, c=in



accused persons would issue invoice later in the name of their newly established firm. But neither the jewellery was returned nor any payment was made. When the complainant *de facto* insisted, the co-accused handed over two cheques of Rs.8,00,000/- and Rs.7,33,675/- towards part payment, but on being presented, both cheques got dishonoured with the remark that the concerned bank account had already been closed way back in the year 2018.

3.2 During investigation, it was found that the complainant *de facto* had indeed supplied the gold jewellery at behest of the accused persons, but the GST registration details of the jewellery recipients, namely Jai Ambe Jewellers, which GST particulars had been furnished by the accused/applicant, were found to be fake. The investigator found that the address mentioned in the GST particulars supplied by the accused/applicant was actually a residential address of Gujarat and not a jewellery business establishment. Further, the co-accused during his interrogation admitted that they do not run any jewellery business.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that it is a case of purely civil liability, which has been twisted into a criminal case only to arm-twist the accused/applicant. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that it is settled law that at the inception of the transaction, the accused must have a dishonest intention in order to make out a case of cheating and since in the present case, at the initial stage, the



accused/applicant had admittedly made part payment of the cost of jewellery, it is not a case of cheating. It is submitted by learned counsel that accused/applicant is a young man and if arrested, he would suffer harm.

5. Learned APP assisted by Investigating Officer/SI Shivam Malik strongly opposes the anticipatory bail application, submitting that the Investigating Officer was also supplied by the complainant *de facto*, a tape recorded conversation between the complainant *de facto* and the accused/applicant in which the latter admitted the above mentioned transactions. Further, on instructions of Investigating Officer, learned APP submits that custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is required in this case, for recovery of the cheated gold jewellery, for tracing the proceeds of crime, for identifying the complete money trail, for apprehending remaining accused persons and for collecting evidence related to the larger conspiracy. It is submitted that the accused/applicant did not join investigation despite service of notice.

6. So far as the legal position is concerned, the submission of learned counsel for accused/applicant is absolutely undisputed that in order to distinguish a case of cheating from a case of purely civil liability, one of the factors is to ascertain the dishonest intention, if any, at the time of inception. But merely because at the time of inception, the accused/applicant made part payment of the cost of the jewellery, in view of further circumstances it cannot be said his intention was clear. Rather, the further circumstances as

BAIL APPLN. 1283/2026

Page 4 of 6 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

[illegible]

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By:RAHUL YADAV
Signing Date:13.08.2026
16:58:47



recapitulated below would show that the accused/applicant made part payment in the first transaction only to win over confidence of the complainant *de facto* and thereafter induced the complainant *de facto* to deliver jewellery of much higher worth. One of those further circumstances is that the accused/applicant furnished false GST particulars of Jai Ambe Jewellers, address whereof, according to the investigation, was only a residence from where no business of jewellery was being carried out. Another circumstance is that the accused/applicant issued cheques to the complainant *de facto* on the bank account which had already been closed way back in the year 2018 itself. I am of *prima facie* view that it is not a case of purely civil liability.

7. Of course, on the above aspects, the trial court shall take independent view at the time of culmination of trial, but for present purposes, I am not convinced with the submission that no offence of cheating is made out.

8. Keeping in mind the above circumstances, the requirement expressed by the Investigating Officer for custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant does not appear to be unjustified. It is not just the case property cheated gold jewellery which has to be recovered, it is also the tracing of the proceeds of crime, ascertaining the overall expanse of the alleged fraud and involvement of other persons also, which has to be unearthed by the Investigating Officer. Since the accused/applicant did not join investigation despite service of notice, the opposition to this



2026:DHC:6628



anticipatory bail application by the Investigating Officer is not wrong.

9. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the accused/applicant.

10. Therefore, the anticipatory bail application and accompanying application are dismissed.

**GIRISH
KATHPALIA**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401dd889027a77b2f65ffffe4fec455
69af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca, ou=HIGH
COURT OF DELHI, cn=7047638,
postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=d3686796451ec45c07b5d15570
996b40f80cbd2ee60402c487965f801e26fa,
cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2026.08.13 16:50:37 +05'30'

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 13, 2026/ry