



\$~3

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

CNR No. DLHC010199142026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1756/2026**

ROHIT @ ROHITA @ KUNAL

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. R. K. Tarun, Ms. Aditi
Shivadhatri, Mr. Hemant Jain, Ms.
Khushi Gupta, Capt. Subedita Rani
and Mr. R. R. Bharti, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for
the State alongwith SI Rajeshwar
Parmar, PS Hauz Qazi

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER
24.08.2026

%

1. By virtue of the present bail application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in FIR no.118/2025 dated 28.04.2025 under *Sections 309(4)/311/317(2)/61(2)/238/3(5)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and *Sections 25/27* of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at PS.: Hauz Qazi.

2. *Succinctly put*, the present FIR came to be registered on the complaint of Mr. Sudhakar Shukla (*complainant*), who had stated therein that while going to his employer's house on 28.04.2025 he was robbed of Rs.60,00,000/- at about 04:00 PM on gunpoint. Pursuant thereto, during the investigation, the CCTV footage revealed presence of the applicant alongwith other co-accused persons on the spot wherefrom the



complainant had collected the cash. Further investigation revealed, *firstly* that the existence of Call Detail Records (**CDRs**) *inter-se* the applicant and co-accused persons; *secondly* that the recovery of Rs.9,00,000/- cash was made from the applicant; *thirdly* that the applicant was involved in stealing a motorcycle and changing its number plate to avoid identification; and *fourthly* that the applicant had given the pistol to the co-accused persons used for commission of the offence.

3. In the proceedings before the learned Trial Court, charges have since been framed and the matter is currently at the stage of prosecution evidence.

4. In this factual backdrop, this Court has heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP, as also perused the materials on record.

5. As borne out, though the applicant has been facing incarceration for the last 16 (*sixteen*) months and the charges have already been framed, as also the co-accused persons have been granted regular bail and an amount of Rs.09,00,000/- has already been recovered, however, the same have to weighed against the factum that the applicant is/ was involved in as many as 78 (*seventy-eight*) FIRs, some of which are involving serious and heinous offences. Even though, the applicant has not been convicted in all of the 78 (*seventy-eight*) FIRs, however, his involvement reflects that he is indeed a habitual offender. Moreover, it cannot escape the attention of this Court that as per the Nominal Roll he has proceeded to commit offence arising from the present FIR whilst on bail in as many as *four* FIRs.

6. Moreover, the material witnesses are yet to be examined.

7. In view thereof, it is evident that the applicant has misused his liberty by committing the offence involved whilst on bail as also his *prima*



facie involvement and an active role in the present FIR is apparent. Also, in the considered opinion of this Court there may be chances of the applicant influencing the witnesses and/ or tampering with the evidence and/ or committing similar offences if enlarged on bail.

8. Lastly, under such circumstances the applicant cannot seek parity with the other co-accused persons as the role assigned to them are completely different from that of the applicant.

9. As such, the present application seeking regular bail is hereby dismissed.

10. Needless to say, expression of view(s) on the merits, if any, are solely for the purposes of adjudication of the present application and shall have no bearing on the overall case/ trial involved.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

AUGUST 24, 2026/So