



\$~49

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

Date of decision: 5th May, 2026.

Uploaded on: 7th May, 2026

+

CRL.A. 333/2026

ANIS AHMED

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sadan Farasat Sr. Advocate with
Mr. A Nowfal, Ms. Varisha Sharma,
Mr. Shereef KA, Mr. Md Arif Hussain,
Mr. Mansur Ali, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, SPP.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present appeal has been filed by the Appellant-Anis Ahmed under Section 21(4) of the National Investigation Act, 2008, *inter alia*, assailing the order dated 27th March, 2026 (hereinafter, '*impugned order*') passed by the Id. Additional Sessions Judge-03, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi District, Delhi. The present case arises from **RC No. 14/2022/NIA/DLI** registered at PS. NIA, New Delhi.
3. *Vide* the impugned order, the application filed by the Appellant seeking interim bail has been rejected. The Appellant had sought interim bail on the ground that his mother and his immediate family is travelling for '*Haj Pilgrimage*' and that he would like to meet his family in this context.



4. The submission of Mr. Shadan Farasat, Id. Senior Counsel for the Appellant is that Haj Ceremony is a part of the Appellant's cultural customs and it is usual for family members to meet and seek blessings especially from those people who are travelling for the '*Haj Pilgrimage*'. Hence, the prayer for interim bail for a period of six days.

5. The prayer for interim bail is opposed by the National Investigation Agency (hereinafter, '*NIA*'). Mr. Tyagi, Id. SPP submits that the Appellant is a senior member of the Popular Front of India (hereinafter, '*PFI*') which is a banned organization. According to the Id. SPP, the Appellant has played a very important role in the administration of the said organisation.

6. The apprehension on behalf of the NIA is that releasing the Appellant on interim bail and especially for attending a cultural function surrounding the '*Haj Pilgrimage*' would enable the Appellant to interact with several members of the community as well and could also result in a threat to the security of the country. Id. SPP also submits that the Appellant is likely to create disturbances and disharmony.

7. The Court has considered the matter. In paragraph 17.36.3 of the charge-sheet dated 18th March, 2023, the role of the Appellant has been described as under:

***“17.36.3 Role of accused Anis Ahmed (A-3), S/o Ahmed Moosa, aged 39 years r/o Karnataka
A-3 was a Member of NBC since 2012 and had also been the Secretary and General Secretary of PFI. As the office bearer of PFI at the national level, A-3 had been involved in overseeing all the administrative work of the organization. Investigation has revealed that as a member of NEC, A-3 along with co-accused persons***



was involved in criminal conspiracy and played a pivotal role in **instigating the gullible Muslim youth** by communalization of issues like Gujarat riots, alleged atrocities against Muslims with the intention to create a communal wedge in the society and to portray the entire State machinery as against a particular religious community. **Further, it is also established that A-3 during the provocative speeches, was found giving open calls to PFI cadres for identification of local leaders of a particular organisation, who is against the ideology of PFI.** It also surfaced during investigation that senior PFI leaders including Anis Ahmed (A-3) used to visit the terror camps conducted at Freedom Hall, Mittur, Karnataka and at other places in the country across India **to review the progress of weapons training and motivated participants to create a PFI army and to wage war against the Government of India and establish Islamic Caliphate by 2047.** A-3 was also **involved in planning for procurement of fire arms for PFI.**

Further, **A-3 along with other NEC members, conducted meetings at PFI office, Shaheen Bagh, Delhi to formulate and oversee the policies of PFI including expansion of PFI through radicalising and recruiting young muslims, providing weapons training classes** across the country through Beginners and Advance training classes, collection of funds and facilitating funds to persons for commission of terrorist activities. **A-3 was in charge and responsible for the conduct of all the illegal activities of PFI and was involved in conspiracy to commit unlawful violent terrorist acts.**

Investigation has established that A-3 had been trying to provoke muslims by using derogatory comments against the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by alleging that the Babri Masjid Verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was not written in the Hon'ble Court, but was written at xxxxxxx and the Hon'ble judges only



pronounced it. A-3 was found to be involved in creating communal disharmony in the society and disrupting the sovereignty and integrity of India.

Based on the above evidences, A-3 has committed w/s 120B,121A, 122, 153A, 505 of IPC, sec.13,17,18,18A,18B, 22C of UA(P)A.”

8. A perusal of the above would show that the Appellant is an office bearer of PFI at the national level and was overseeing all the administrative work of the said organisation across the country. According to the said charge-sheet, the Appellant was also involved in radicalising and recruiting muslims and providing weapon training. The activities of the PFI were being actively run by the Appellant, who is also alleged to be in conspiracy with unlawful organisations and also involved in unlawful terrorist acts.

9. Mr. Farasat, Id. Senior Counsel for the Appellant submits that the said charges against the Appellant are not true and in fact, the weapons referred in the said charge-sheet are self-defence weapons.

10. In the past, the role of PFI has been discussed by this Court in the decision in *O.M.A Salam v. National Investigation Agency, 2024:DHC:6552-DB*. This Court in the said decision had also considered the observations made by the High Court of Kerala in respect of PFI as an organisation and the kind of mass disturbance that was created on the ground when the leaders and other members of the PFI were arrested.

11. The Court has considered the overall facts. While there can be no doubt that the ‘*Haj Pilgrimage*’ is a religious piligrimage which is of immense importance and is a very pious trip for those who are undertaking it, the mere travel of family members for the ‘*Haj Pilgrimage*’ and for the Appellant to meet them is not sufficient ground to release the Appellant on interim bail. In



the opinion of this Court there are various apprehensions considering the position that the Appellant was holding. Moreover, grant of interim bail entails the travel of the Appellant from Delhi to Bangalore, which could also result in security threat at the airports etc.

12. Under these circumstances, the prayer for interim bail is rejected and appeal is dismissed.

13. Needless to add, this Court has not gone into the merits of the allegations at this stage. The only thing the Court has examined is whether in light of the allegations made, the prayer for interim bail is made out or not in terms of Section 43D(5) of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967. Considering the role of the Appellant as set out in the charge-sheet, and the role of the Appellant in the PFI organisation, this Court is not inclined to release the Appellant on interim bail.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

MADHU JAIN
JUDGE

MAY 5, 2026

Rahul/ck