



\$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010404102026
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3569/2026&CRL.M.A. 26535-26536/2026**
TIL BAHADUR Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurabh Yadav, Advocate
versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) Respondent
Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

% **ORDER**
31.08.2026

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 84/2026 dated 26.01.2026, registered at P.S. Burari, for commission of offences under Sections 331(3)/3(3) *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)* (corresponding Section 454 IPC). According to prosecution, the case relates to Section 305(a) BNS (corresponding Section 380 IPC).
2. The abovesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint of Ms. Kamlesh, who claimed that she was tenant under the applicant and was residing at tenanted premises, situated at Sant Nagar, Burari for last more than 18 years. A Civil Suit was already pending with respect to the above tenancy, in which, a *Local Commissioner* had been appointed. According to complaint, on the date of the incident i.e. 22.11.2025, her landlord, along with Ajay and Amit Dev, trespassed into her property by breaking open its lock and removed all her articles, including cash and jewellery and loaded those into a tempo bearing No. DL 1LAD 3926.
3. FIR was registered on 26.01.2026, *albeit*, her report given to police is

BAIL APPLN. 3569/2026

1



of the date of the incident itself.

4. She also handed over video footage, which was provided by her one neighbor in which, co-accused Amit Dev could be seen loading the goods in the abovesaid vehicle.

5. Such co-accused Amit Dev is still at large and is evading arrest.

6. Learned counsel for applicant submits that co-accused Ajay has, however, been granted bail and, therefore, bail is being sought on the ground of parity.

7. According to learned counsel for applicant, a false case has been registered by his tenant and the applicant has no involvement with the alleged incident. It is also claimed that at the relevant time, he was away to Nepal.

8. Learned APP for the State, however, submits that there is a clear-cut conspiracy amongst all the accused persons. He states that the landlord i.e. applicant actually wanted to sell the tenanted property through broker Amit Dev and it was with the abovesaid intent in the mind that the goods and the belongings of the tenant were got loaded in a tempo in a wrongful and illegal manner and submits that the custodial interrogation of the applicant would be very much imperative to recover all such goods. He also states that case of Ajay is on different footing as he, when served with notice under Section 35(3) BNS, joined the investigation.

9. There is no document on record which may indicate that the applicant had left country for Nepal or that returned to India against valid documents and that during the relevant period, he was not in India.

10. Apparently, the applicant herein is the sole beneficiary.

11. Keeping in mind the allegations made by the complainant, as well as the video footage, and the fact that the goods were removed on the same day



when the Local Commissioner was scheduled to visit the abovesaid property, this Court does not find any compelling reason to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant herein.

12. Therefore, finding no merit and substance in the present application, same is accordingly dismissed.

13. Pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

MANOJ JAIN, J

AUGUST 31, 2026/sw/js