



\$~76

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 326/2024**
VIKAS@VIKKY Applicant

Through: Mr. Hitesh Baisla, Mr. Jai
Vats & Mr. Khilender
Dayma, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI Respondent

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the
State
Inspector Sunil Kumar,
PS- Gulabi Bagh

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **19.03.2024**

1. The present application is filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') seeking regular bail in FIR No. 268/2020 dated 11.12.2020, registered at Police Station Gulabi Bagh for offences punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959. The chargesheet is filed against the applicant for offences under Sections 302/392/395/120B/34 of the IPC.

2. It is alleged that on 11.12.2020, a PCR call was received that the victim with a bullet injury is lying near the Metro Pillar No. 142, Pratap Nagar. On being taken to the hospital, the victim was declared 'brought dead'.

3. On perusal of the CCTV footage, it was found that four assailants were allegedly chasing the deceased victim. One of the said motorcycles was traced and was found to be registered in the name of one, Pushpa. During the course of investigation, Pushpa was questioned, who disclosed that the said bike was driven by her brother-in-law, namely, Harish. It is alleged that co-accused

BAIL APPLN. 326/2024

Page 1 of 6



Harish was arrested and on being interrogated, disclosed that the accused persons had conspired to rob the victim. He disclosed that he along with three other assailants, including the applicant, had followed the victim on two motorcycles.

4. He disclosed that he was riding one of the motorcycles with co-accused Gaurav as the pillion rider, and the applicant was riding the other motorcycle with co-accused Lokesh as the pillion rider. He further disclosed that the accused persons on the motorcycles, including the applicant, had tried to snatch the bag from the victim. He disclosed that co-accused Gaurav *alias* Gori allegedly shot the victim when he resisted. The applicant was arrested on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Harish.

5. During investigation, co-accused persons, namely, Sumit and Ishwar were also arrested. It is alleged that the said co-accused persons had intimidated the assailants about the victim's location.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the only evidence against the applicant, at this stage, is the disclosure statement made by the co-accused Harish.

7. He submits that the statement given by the co-accused is not admissible. He submits that the applicant is not seen in the CCTV footage and the sole eye witness of the alleged incident has also failed to identify the applicant.

8. He submits that the CCTV footage doesn't show the incident of firing of the gun shot. He submits that there is no allegation against the applicant that he carried any fire arm. He further submits that no recovery has been effectuated at the instance of the applicant.

9. He further submits that the chargesheet has already been
BAIL APPLN. 326/2024

Page 2 of 6



filed. The applicant has no criminal antecedents and is under incarceration since 31.12.2020.

10. He submits that co-accused persons, that is, Ishwar and Sumit, have been granted bail by this Court by orders dated 09.05.2023 and 30.11.2023 respectively. He further submits that co-accused Gaurav *alias* Gori was granted bail by this Court *vide* order dated 01.02.2024.

11. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State submits that the applicant is involved in a heinous crime of murder and the evidence collected thus far supports the case of prosecution.

12. He submits that the CDR location of the applicant clearly indicates that the applicant was present at the place of the crime at the time of the alleged incident.

13. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

14. The case of the prosecution is that on analysis of the CCTV footage, it was found that four assailants were chasing the deceased victim on two motorcycles. The accused persons were identified when one of the motorcycles, found to be driven in suspicious circumstances was captured in the CCTV footage and found to be registered in the name of the sister-in-law of co-accused Harish. The co-accused Harish is alleged to have been riding the said motorcycle. The alleged pistol, as per the prosecution, was recovered at the instance of the co-accused Harish. On being asked, it is submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, that the FSL Report in regard to the said pistol, is still pending.

15. It is settled law that the Court cannot conduct a mini trial at the time of considering an application for bail. However, for
BAIL APPLN. 326/2024

Page 3 of 6



the limited purpose of ascertaining if there exists a *prima facie* case in favour of the applicant warranting grant of bail, the material can be looked into for indicating the reasons thereof. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Lt. Col. Prasad Shrikant Purohit v. State of Maharashtra : (2018) 11 SCC 458***, held as under:

“29. The law in regard to grant or refusal of bail is very well settled. The court granting bail should exercise its discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Though at the stage of granting bail a detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of the merit of the case need not be undertaken, there is a need to indicate in such orders reasons for prima facie concluding why bail was being granted particularly where the accused is charged of having committed a serious offence. Any order devoid of such reasons would suffer from non-application of mind. It is also necessary for the court granting bail to consider, among other circumstances, the following factors also before granting bail; they are:

(a) The nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence.

(b) Reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant.

(c) Prima facie satisfaction of the court in support of the charge.”

16. At this stage, the only material against the present applicant is the disclosure statement of the co-accused Harish and his alleged presence at the crime spot as per the CDR. It is for the learned Trial Court to assess the evidentiary value of this material at the appropriate stage.

17. It is not denied that the recovery of the alleged weapon was not from the present applicant. Even so, in the absence of the FSL Report, at this stage, it cannot be said that the pistol allegedly recovered was used in the commission of the crime.

18. At this stage, there is no material on record to *prima facie*



show the active involvement of the applicant. It is also relevant to note that the role of the applicant, in any case, is not graver than that of co-accused Gaurav who has already been granted bail by this Court.

19. It is the case of the prosecution that there was a public eye-witness who has seen the incident. It is not denied that the said eye-witness has not identified the applicant. While four individuals have been seen allegedly chasing the victim on the CCTV footage, the applicant has not been identified therein.

20. It is trite law that in case the Court finds some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, the accused is entitled for the grant of bail.

21. The applicant is in custody since 31.12.2020 and the investigation in relation to the applicant is already complete. The chargesheet has already been filed in the present case. It is not disputed that trial would take a considerable period of time.

22. Considering the aforesaid facts, I am of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant in further incarceration.

23. Any apprehension regarding the applicant tampering with the evidence or fleeing from justice if released on bail can be taken care of by putting appropriate conditions.

24. In view of the above, the applicant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond for a sum of ₹20,000/- with one surety of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court / Duty MM / Link MM, on the following conditions:

- a. He shall not make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner

BAIL APPLN. 326/2024

Page 5 of 6



whatsoever;

- b. He shall under no circumstances leave the boundaries of the country without informing the IO;
- c. He shall appear before the learned Trial Court on every date of hearing;
- d. He shall, upon his release, give his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on at all times;
- e. He shall provide the address where he would be residing after his release and shall not change the address without informing the concerned IO/SHO.

25. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry / complaint lodged against the applicant, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by seeking cancellation of bail.

26. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and should not influence the outcome of the Trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27. The bail application is allowed in the aforementioned terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 19, 2024/ ssh