Application for Regular Bail under Section 483 BNSS

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi

INDEX

State (NCT of Delhi) v. **Kabir Anand Solanki**
FIR No. 000/2026, Police Station Nandan Bagh

1. Memo of parties
2. First application for regular bail before this Court under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023
3. Disclosure affidavit in support of the application, sworn by the pairokar, Meera Solanki
4. Annexure A-1: copy of the FIR
5. Annexure A-2: copy of the notice dated 20 August 2026 under section 35(3) BNSS, with the acknowledgement of the documents handed over
6. Annexure A-3: copies of the arrest memo and the written grounds of arrest
7. Annexure A-4 (colly): copies of the remand orders
8. Annexure A-5: copy of the bail application before the Judicial Magistrate and the order dated 22 September 2026 dismissing it
9. Annexure A-6 (colly): purchase order, delivery challans and bank statement extract
10. Annexure A-7 (colly): proof of identity, residence and occupation
11. Annexure A-8 (colly): medical papers of the Applicant and his mother
12. Vakalatnama

MEMO OF PARTIES

Kabir Anand Solanki, son of Anand Raghav Solanki
Aged 42 years, occupation: proprietor of Solanki Kitchen Works
Resident of House No. 00, Block Z, Amrit Vihar Extension, New Delhi 110000
At present in judicial custody at Central Jail No. 0, Delhi
Through his pairokar, Meera Solanki ... **Applicant / Accused**

versus

State (NCT of Delhi)
Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Nandan Bagh
Represented by the Public Prosecutor, South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi ... **Respondent**

Complainant (for notice): **Devdutt Pathare**, Blue Lotus Interiors, Plot 00, Suvarna Market, New Delhi 110000

Filed through: **Ishani Deshkar**, Advocate, Enrolment No. D/0000/2014
Chamber 000, Lawyers' Block, Saket Courts, New Delhi 110017
Phone: +91 00000 00001

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 0000 of 2026

FIRST BAIL APPLICATION BEFORE THIS COURT
(One earlier application, before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, was dismissed on 22 September 2026. No bail application is pending in any court.)

In the matter of:

Kabir Anand Solanki ... Applicant / Accused

versus

State (NCT of Delhi) ... Respondent

FIR No.: 000/2026 dated 12 August 2026
Police Station: Nandan Bagh, District South, Delhi
Section: 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023
Date of arrest: 4 September 2026
Next date before the Magistrate: 19 October 2026

APPLICATION FOR REGULAR BAIL UNDER SECTION 483 OF THE BHARATIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA, 2023, ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT / ACCUSED

To,
The Principal District and Sessions Judge and the companion Judges of this Court

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

The Applicant is in judicial custody in the above case. He applies through his advocate and his wife and pairokar, Meera Solanki, for release on regular bail. In this application, "**BNSS**" means the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, "**BNS**" means the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the "**FIR**" means the first information report named in the caption, the "**Complainant**" means Devdutt Pathare, and the "**IO**" means the investigating officer, Sub-Inspector Prakash Dhillonwal. The facts below are stated to the best of the knowledge and instructions available. They are supported by the affidavit filed with this application.

1. Particulars of the case

1.1 The material particulars of the case are:

FIR number and date: 000/2026 dated 12 August 2026**Police station, district and State:** Nandan Bagh, South, Delhi**Section invoked:** section 318(4) BNS (cheating and dishonestly inducing delivery of property)**Maximum punishment:** imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to seven years, and fine**Classification:** cognizable, non-bailable and triable by a Magistrate of the first class**Date of arrest:** 4 September 2026**Custody on the date of this application:** 41 days, counting the day of arrest**Place of custody:** Central Jail No. 0, Delhi**Stage:** investigation; no charge sheet has been filed**Witnesses cited / examined:** not applicable; no charge sheet has been filed**Next date before the Magistrate:** 19 October 2026

1.2 The Applicant is not accused of any offence punishable with death or imprisonment for life. No provision of a special Act that limits the grant of bail has been invoked in the FIR.

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

2. The applicant

2.1 The Applicant is 42 years old. He has carried on business as proprietor of Solanki Kitchen Works for eleven years from a rented workshop close to his home. He files his tax returns and runs the business through one current account, which the Complainant used for every payment in issue.

2.2 The Applicant has lived at House No. 00, Block Z, Amrit Vihar Extension, New Delhi 110000 since 2012 with his wife, his two school-going children and his mother, who is 71 years old and undergoes dialysis twice a week. He is the only earning member of the household. Proof of identity, residence and occupation is at Annexure A-7 (colly).

2.3 The Applicant has no property or family outside India. He holds no passport. His home, work and family are all within the jurisdiction of this Court.

2.4 The Applicant is represented by an advocate of his choice, whose vakalatnama is filed with this application.

3. Prosecution case in brief

3.1 What follows is a summary of the prosecution case as it appears from the FIR. The Applicant does not admit it. A copy of the FIR is at Annexure A-1.

3.2 The Complainant fits out commercial interiors. The FIR says that on 16 March 2026 the Complainant ordered twelve modular kitchen units from the Applicant and transferred Rs 18,40,000 to him in three instalments as an advance. The units were to be delivered within 60 days.

3.3 The FIR says that the Applicant delivered only some of the units, gave excuses for the rest and stopped answering calls in July 2026. The Complainant alleges that the Applicant never intended to complete the order and dishonestly induced him to part with the money.

3.4 The FIR names no other accused. It does not allege forgery, violence, threat or the use of a false identity.

3.5 The Applicant's answer, in brief, is that the dispute concerns late performance of a real commercial order. He delivered units worth Rs 7,10,000 under signed challans. The balance was held up because his hardware supplier closed its factory in June 2026. He told the Complainant so by email and offered a revised delivery schedule. The purchase order, the challans and the bank entries are at Annexure A-6 (colly). These documents are relied on only for bail, and without prejudice to the defence.

4. Arrest, remand and custody

4.1 On 20 August 2026 the IO served a notice under section 35(3) BNSS requiring the Applicant to appear. The Applicant appeared on 24 and 29 August 2026. He answered the questions put to him and handed over his order book, the challans, his bank statements and his mobile phone against acknowledgement. Copies are at Annexure A-2.

4.2 The Applicant did not miss any date given to him. No further notice was served on him. The IO nevertheless arrested him on 4 September 2026. The arrest memo at Annexure A-3 gives the reason only as "to prevent tampering and for proper investigation". It does not record why a person who was complying with the notice ought to be arrested, or what had changed since his last appearance.

4.3 The written grounds of arrest were handed to the Applicant at 10.15 a.m. on 5 September 2026. He was produced before the duty Magistrate at 11.20 a.m. on the same day. The interval was less than two hours. The Applicant's advocate received a copy only when the case was called and objected on

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

this point before the remand order was made. The remand order of 5 September 2026 notes the objection but does not decide it.

4.4 The Magistrate remanded the Applicant to police custody for two days. He was sent to judicial custody on 7 September 2026, and judicial custody has been extended since then. The current remand ends on 19 October 2026. The remand orders are at Annexure A-4 (colly).

4.5 During police custody the Applicant was taken to his workshop. The police seized one ledger and two part-finished units. No other recovery was sought or made. The IO has not asked for further police custody.

4.6 The evidence on which the FIR rests is documentary. It consists of the purchase order, bank records, challans and emails. The original records taken from the Applicant are already with the IO and the banks hold their own records. No test identification is pending, because the Complainant and the Applicant know each other.

5. Previous and pending bail applications

5.1 **Decided applications.** The Applicant filed one application for bail before the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi, being Bail Application No. 00/2026, on 14 September 2026. It was dismissed by order dated 22 September 2026. Copies of the application and the order are at Annexure A-5.

5.2 **Grounds raised and reasons given.** The application before the Magistrate raised five grounds: (a) no dishonest intention at the start, shown by part delivery; (b) arrest in spite of compliance with the notice under section 35(3) BNSS; (c) late supply of the written grounds of arrest, less than two hours before production; (d) completion of police custody and the documentary nature of the evidence; and (e) clean antecedents, fixed residence and family hardship. The order does not deal with ground (c). The learned Magistrate gave three reasons for refusal: the amount involved, the early stage of the investigation, and an apprehension that witnesses might be influenced. The Applicant answers each of them in paragraph 7. Grounds (a) to (e) are raised again in this application, and the Applicant discloses that fact.

5.3 **Pending applications.** No bail application by the Applicant in this FIR is pending in this Court, in any court below it or in any higher court.

5.4 **This Court and higher courts.** This is the first bail application of the Applicant before this Court. He has not applied for regular or anticipatory bail in this FIR before any Court of Session, the High Court of Delhi or the Supreme Court of India.

5.5 If any other application by or for the Applicant comes to notice before this application is decided, the Applicant will disclose it to this Court without delay.

6. Criminal antecedents and coercive processes

6.1 **Criminal antecedents.** Apart from this FIR, no FIR, complaint case or criminal trial is pending against the Applicant in any State. He has never been convicted of, or acquitted in, any criminal case. This statement is based on his instructions and on the papers available to his family.

6.2 **Coercive processes.** No non-bailable warrant has been issued against the Applicant in this case. He has not been declared a proclaimed offender, and no proceeding for that purpose has been started to the knowledge of the Applicant or his pairokar.

6.3 **Conduct in this investigation.** The Applicant has not been served with any notice alleging that

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

he contacted, threatened or offered anything to a witness.

6.4 The Applicant understands that bail may be refused or recalled if a material fact is hidden. He has made this disclosure fully and will correct it at once if a correction becomes necessary.

7. Grounds for bail

The Applicant seeks bail on the following grounds, which are in the alternative and without prejudice to each other:

7.1 **No reasonable ground to believe in dishonest intention at the start.** The offence alleged requires dishonest inducement. The Applicant delivered goods worth Rs 7,10,000 under the same order before any complaint was made. He used his true name, his true address and his regular bank account. Part performance on this scale is consistent with a genuine order that ran late. The question will be decided at trial, but the material now available does not justify continued detention.

7.2 **Nature and gravity of the accusation.** The Applicant does not say that the accusation is trivial. It is a single transaction between two businesses, with no allegation of violence, forgery or an organised scheme. The sum in dispute is one circumstance to be weighed with the rest. It does not settle the question of bail.

7.3 **Severity of punishment.** The maximum sentence is seven years and the offence is triable by a Magistrate of the first class. In *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, judgment dated 11 July 2022, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. It said that a better exercise of discretion in favour of the accused is expected in category A cases. Category A covers offences punishable with imprisonment of seven years or less that do not fall in categories B and D.

7.4 **Arrest in spite of compliance with the notice.** The Applicant complied with the notice under section 35(3) BNSS. Under section 35(5), a person who complies and continues to comply shall not be arrested for that offence unless the police officer, for reasons to be recorded, is of the opinion that he ought to be arrested. In *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2026 INSC 115, the Supreme Court held that for offences punishable with imprisonment up to seven years a notice under section 35(3) is the rule and arrest is a clear exception, and that a later arrest under section 35(6) must rest on material that was not available when the notice was issued. The arrest memo names no such material. The stock words in it are not recorded reasons of the kind that section 35(5) requires. The earlier judgment of 11 July 2022 holds that courts must satisfy themselves of compliance with sections 41 and 41A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and that non-compliance entitles the accused to bail. Those provisions are now found in section 35 BNSS.

7.5 **Grounds of arrest.** *Mihir Rajesh Shah v. State of Maharashtra*, 2025 INSC 1288, requires the grounds of arrest to be given in writing at least two hours before the arrestee is produced for remand. The interval here was shorter, as paragraph 4.3 shows. The rule governs arrests made after that judgment of 6 November 2025, and the Applicant was arrested on 4 September 2026. Paragraph 53 of the judgment explains that the interval gives counsel adequate time to scrutinise the basis of arrest and to prepare to oppose remand. Counsel could not study the grounds before the remand hearing, and that is the prejudice. The objection was first taken at the remand hearing and was raised again in the application before the Magistrate, as paragraphs 4.3 and 5.2 show. Paragraph 56(iv) states that non-compliance renders the arrest and the subsequent remand illegal.

The Applicant also draws attention to *State of Meghalaya v. Sonam Raghuvanshi*, SLP (Crl.) No. 11944 of 2026, order dated 23 July 2026. There the Supreme Court set aside bail that had been granted on a defect in the grounds of arrest. It distinguished non-service of the grounds, which might

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

vitiate the arrest, from inadequate reasons in the grounds, where prejudice must be seen (paragraph 11). It held that an accused who earlier sought a finding on the merits cannot go back and raise the plea afterwards (paragraph 12). That case differs in four respects. The arrest there was on 9 June 2025, before *Mihir Rajesh Shah*. The plea was taken only in the fourth bail application, while here it was taken at remand and in the first. That accused had told the remand Magistrate that she knew the grounds of her arrest, while here objection was made. The trial there had begun, and here no charge sheet has been filed. The complaint here is of late service, not of inadequate reasons, and prejudice is shown in any event. The order also says that release on this ground does not prevent re-arrest for investigation.

In *Jaskaran Jeet Singh Deol v. State of Punjab*, 2026 INSC 1022, judgment dated 21 September 2026, the Supreme Court considered that order and *Mihir Rajesh Shah* together. It noted that the arrest in *Sonam Raghuvanshi* took place before *Mihir Rajesh Shah*, and held that *Mihir Rajesh Shah* states the correct legal position (paragraph 22). It also held that when there is a violation of Article 22(1) of the Constitution, the question of prejudice does not arise (paragraph 23). If the police consider re-arrest necessary after a release for such a breach, they must apply to the Magistrate (paragraph 24). The Applicant pleads prejudice only as a further answer. He relies on the breach in support of bail and reserves his right to challenge the arrest and remand in separate proceedings.

7.6 **No danger of absconding.** The Applicant has lived at one address since 2012. His business, his children's school and his mother's dialysis centre are nearby. He came to the police station on every date given while he was free. He did not leave Delhi after he learnt of the FIR. He offers to report to the IO and not to leave India without permission.

7.7 **Character, behaviour, means, position and standing.** The Applicant has no antecedents. He is a small trader who holds no public office and has no authority over the Complainant or any witness named in the FIR.

7.8 **No likelihood of repetition.** The allegation concerns one order. The Applicant has no pending advance from any other customer. He undertakes not to commit any offence similar to the one alleged.

7.9 **No reasonable apprehension of witnesses being influenced.** The Complainant is an established contractor and the remaining witnesses are his employees and bank officers. The documents are already in official hands. The order of the learned Magistrate does not refer to any call, message or visit by the Applicant. A condition of no contact will meet any residual concern.

7.10 **No danger of justice being thwarted.** The eight considerations stated in *Prasanta Kumar Sarkar v. Ashis Chatterjee*, (2010) 14 SCC 496, are addressed in paragraphs 7.1 to 7.9. Taken together, they favour release. The investigation can continue with the Applicant on bail, as it did from 20 August 2026 until his arrest.

7.11 **Custodial interrogation is complete.** Police custody ended on 7 September 2026. The Applicant has been in custody for 41 days. The third proviso to section 480(1) BNSS states the principle that being required for identification by witnesses, or for police custody beyond the first fifteen days, is not by itself a sufficient ground for refusing bail to an accused who is otherwise entitled to it and undertakes to comply with the court's directions. The Applicant gives that undertaking in paragraph 9.

7.12 **Preparation of the defence and hardship.** The case turns on business records that only the Applicant can explain to his advocate in detail. His detention has closed the workshop and stopped the household income. These facts are relied on as additional circumstances.

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

8. Special grounds and reserved rights

8.1 **Health.** The Applicant has type 2 diabetes and takes insulin. His prescriptions are at Annexure A-8 (colly). He asks the Court to take his health into account in the exercise of its discretion under section 483 BNSS. He does not need the first proviso to section 480(1), which concerns a child, a woman, or a sick or infirm person who falls within clause (i) or (ii) of that sub-section, because neither clause applies to him.

8.2 **Section 479 BNSS.** The Applicant is a first-time offender within the meaning of the first proviso to section 479(1), as he has never been convicted of any offence. He has not yet undergone detention for one-third of the maximum period of imprisonment specified for the offence. He does not rely on section 479 now and keeps the right to do so.

8.3 **Section 187(3) BNSS.** The offence falls in the class for which the period is sixty days. That period has not expired on the date of this application. If it expires while the Applicant is in custody and the investigation is not complete, the Applicant will seek release under section 187(3) by a separate application and will furnish bail. Nothing in this application waives that right.

9. Undertakings and proposed conditions

If released on bail, the Applicant undertakes to:

9.1 attend the Court on every date in accordance with the conditions of the bond or bail bond, unless his personal attendance is exempted by order;

9.2 not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused;

9.3 not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade that person from disclosing those facts to the Court or to any police officer, and not tamper with the evidence;

9.4 join the investigation whenever the IO calls him by written notice, and attend for identification or for any other purpose that the Court directs;

9.5 not visit, call or message the Complainant or his employees about this case, other than through counsel in proceedings before a court;

9.6 not leave the National Capital Region without informing the IO in writing, and not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;

9.7 keep the mobile number +91 00000 00000 switched on and available to the IO, and give the IO and the Court written notice of any change of address or number within three days;

9.8 report to the IO at Police Station Nandan Bagh every Monday between 10 a.m. and 12 noon until the charge sheet is filed; and

9.9 abide by any other condition that the Court considers necessary.

9.10 These undertakings are voluntary and may be recorded in the order. The Applicant has been told that a Court of Session or the High Court may direct the arrest of a person released on bail and commit him to custody. If any condition becomes impossible to perform, he will apply for modification before acting otherwise.

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

10. Sureties and bond

10.1 The Applicant is ready to execute a bond with one surety in the sum of Rs 50,000, or in such other sum as the Court thinks sufficient. Section 484(1) BNSS requires the amount to be fixed with due regard to the circumstances of the case and not to be excessive. The Applicant's modest income and the closure of his workshop are relevant to that amount.

10.2 The proposed surety is **Harit Solanki**, brother of the Applicant, resident of Flat 00, Tower Q, Kusum Enclave, New Delhi 110000. The surety will file proof of identity, address and means, and an affidavit as to sufficiency under section 485(4) if the Court accepts one. The surety will also make the declaration required by section 486 of the number of persons, including the Applicant, for whom he has stood surety, with all relevant particulars.

10.3 If the proposed surety is not accepted, the Applicant asks for reasonable time to offer another. In the alternative, he asks for permission under section 490 to deposit a sum of money or Government promissory notes in lieu of executing a bond.

10.4 The Applicant asks that verification of the surety and transmission of the release order to the officer in charge of Central Jail No. 0, Delhi be completed without avoidable delay once the bond has been executed.

11. Notice to the prosecution and the complainant

11.1 An advance copy of this application, with the affidavit and annexures, has been served on the office of the Public Prosecutor, South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi, and on the IO on 13 October 2026. The offence is not triable exclusively by the Court of Session and is not punishable with imprisonment for life, so the notice required by the first proviso to section 483(1) BNSS is not compulsory. The copy has been given so that the prosecution can be heard without delay.

11.2 A copy has been sent through the IO to the Complainant, who says he is the victim of the offence. *Jagjeet Singh v. Ashish Mishra*, judgment dated 18 April 2022, recognises the right of a victim to be heard. The Applicant has no objection to the Complainant being heard through counsel. He has not contacted the Complainant directly for the purpose of service.

11.3 The offence alleged is not one to which the obligatory presence of the informant under section 483(2) applies.

11.4 The Applicant asks that a definite early date be fixed. The judgment of 11 July 2022 in *Satender Kumar Antil* says that bail applications ought to be disposed of within two weeks, except where the provisions require otherwise. The Applicant will not seek an adjournment.

PRAYER

In these circumstances, the Applicant respectfully prays that this Court may be pleased to:

(a) call for the status report and, if necessary, the case diary and the record of the Judicial Magistrate in FIR No. 000/2026, Police Station Nandan Bagh;

(b) direct that the Applicant, **Kabir Anand Solanki**, be released on regular bail under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in FIR No. 000/2026 dated 12 August 2026, registered at Police Station Nandan Bagh under section 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs 50,000 with one surety in the like amount, or on such other terms as the Court thinks fit;

(c) pending final disposal of this application, if it cannot be decided on the first date of hearing,

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

release the Applicant on interim bail on such terms as the Court considers proper;

(d) in the alternative to a bond, permit the Applicant to deposit such sum of money as the Court fixes under section 490 of that Sanhita;

(e) direct that a copy of the order be sent at once to the officer in charge of Central Jail No. 0, Delhi for communication to the Applicant and compliance after the bond is executed; and

(f) pass any other order that the Court considers just and proper in the facts of the case.

It is prayed accordingly.

Applicant / Accused
Kabir Anand Solanki
Through his pairokar

[Signature of pairokar]**Meera Solanki**
wife of the Applicant

Through:

[Signature of advocate]**Ishani Deshkar**
Advocate, Enrolment No. D/0000/2014
Chamber 000, Lawyers' Block, Saket Courts, New Delhi 110017

Place: New Delhi
Date: 14 October 2026

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 0000 of 2026 **Kabir Anand Solanki** v. **State (NCT of Delhi)**
FIR No. 000/2026, Police Station Nandan Bagh

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF THE BAIL APPLICATION, WITH DISCLOSURE OF MATERIAL PARTICULARS

I, **Meera Solanki**, aged 39 years, wife of the Applicant, resident of House No. 00, Block Z, Amrit Vihar Extension, New Delhi 110000, do solemnly affirm and state as follows:

(1) I am the wife and pairokar of the Applicant, who is in judicial custody. I am competent to swear this affidavit. I know the facts about our family, home and means. I have read the FIR, the remand orders and the order dated 22 September 2026.

(2) I have read the accompanying application, and its contents have been explained to me in a language I understand. I make the following disclosure.

(A) Case details

FIR number and date: 000/2026 dated 12 August 2026
Police station, district and State: Nandan Bagh, South, Delhi
Section invoked: section 318(4) BNS
Maximum punishment prescribed: seven years' imprisonment and fine

(B) Custody and procedural compliance

Date of arrest: 4 September 2026

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

Total period of custody undergone: 41 days on 14 October 2026, counting the day of arrest

(C) Status of trial

Stage of proceedings: investigation; no charge sheet has been filed
Total number of witnesses cited in the charge sheet: not applicable
Number of prosecution witnesses examined: none

(D) Criminal antecedents

FIR number and police station: none other than the present FIR
Sections: not applicable
Status (pending, acquitted or convicted): no other case pending, no acquittal and no conviction

(E) Previous bail applications

Court: Judicial Magistrate First Class, South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi
Case number: Bail Application No. 00/2026
Outcome: dismissed on 22 September 2026 (copy at Annexure A-5)
Other decided applications in any court: none
Pending applications in any court: none

(F) Coercive processes

Whether any non-bailable warrant was issued: no
Whether declared a proclaimed offender: no

(3) The facts in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.4 of the application, and those about the Applicant's health in paragraph 8.1, are within my own knowledge, because I live with the Applicant and help to keep his accounts.

(4) The facts in paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.2 and 8.3 of the application, the facts stated in paragraph 7, and the disclosure under heads (A) to (F) are stated on information that I believe to be true. The grounds of my belief are the documents annexed to the application, what the Applicant told me when I met him in Central Jail No. 0, Delhi on 10 October 2026, and the advice of his advocate on the state of the court record.

(5) The undertakings in paragraph 9 and the proposals about sureties in paragraph 10 are given on the Applicant's instructions, received at the same meeting. The facts about service in paragraph 11 are stated on information received from his advocate. The legal submissions are made on legal advice.

(6) The annexures are true copies of the documents from which they were made. Nothing material has been concealed.

[Signature]**Meera SolankiDEPONENT**

VERIFICATION

Verified at New Delhi on 14 October 2026 that paragraphs (1) to (3) of the above affidavit are true to my own knowledge, and that paragraphs (4) to (6) are true on the information and grounds of belief stated in them. No part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed. I know that giving false evidence in a judicial proceeding is an offence under section 229 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

[Signature]**Meera SolankiDEPONENT**

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.

ATTESTATION

Solemnly affirmed before me at New Delhi on 14 October 2026 by Meera Solanki, who was identified by Ishani Deshkar, Advocate. The contents were read over to the deponent, who said she understood them and signed in my presence.

[Signature and seal]**Oath Commissioner, Delhi**
Registration / serial no.: 000/2026

LIST OF ANNEXURES

Annexure A-1: FIR No. 000/2026 dated 12 August 2026.

Annexure A-2: Notice dated 20 August 2026 under section 35(3) BNSS and the IO's acknowledgement of the documents and mobile phone handed over on 24 and 29 August 2026.

Annexure A-3: Arrest memo dated 4 September 2026 and written grounds of arrest, with the time of receipt endorsed.

Annexure A-4 (colly): Orders remanding the Applicant to police custody and judicial custody, from 5 September 2026 to the last extension.

Annexure A-5: Bail Application No. 00/2026, filed on 14 September 2026 and raising the grounds listed in paragraph 5.2, and the order of dismissal dated 22 September 2026.

Annexure A-6 (colly): Purchase order dated 16 March 2026, signed delivery challans, emails on the revised delivery schedule and extract of the current account.

Annexure A-7 (colly): Proof of identity, rent agreement, electricity bills, tax return acknowledgements and shop registration.

Annexure A-8 (colly): Prescriptions of the Applicant and the dialysis record of his mother.

Vakalatnama in favour of Ishani Deshkar, Advocate.

The charge sheet, with the statements and documents supplied under section 230 BNSS, will be placed on record when it is filed and copies are received. Personal identifiers that the Court does not need, such as full Aadhaar and bank account numbers, are masked in the copies.

Certified as true copies:

[Signature]**Ishani Deshkar**, Advocate
New Delhi, 14 October 2026

Downloaded from legaldraftapp.com. General information, not legal advice. Have a qualified lawyer review this document before you rely on it.