



\$~66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 376/2025**

RAVI @ KISHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Gunjan Sinha Jain, DHCLSC.
versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP with
Insp. Sanjay Kumar, PS Sultanpuri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

%

13.11.2025

CRL.M.A. 33515/2025 (exemption from filing certified copies etc.)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.A. 33514/2025 (modification of order dt. 15.07.2025)

1. This is an application under Section 484 & 490 BNSS read with Section 528 BNSS with the following prayer:

It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble court may please to allow the present application and to kindly: -

a. Modify the order dated 15.07.2025 to the extent that petitioner be released on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate and/or

b. pass any other order or further orders, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the interest of justice;

2. The Court takes note that by order dated 15.07.2025, the applicant was granted bail subject to various conditions including the condition that he



would furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 30,000/- with a surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial court/Duty Magistrate.

3. The Ld. Counsel submits that applicant belongs to a poor strata of society. His wife who is residing in Delhi is unemployed and is unable to furnish surety for the applicant. His aged parents and brother are residents of Rajasthan and are unable to travel to Delhi due to financial constraints. It is, therefore, requested that the surety amount be reduced from 30,000/- to 10,000/-.

4. The Ld. APP appearing for the State submits that the wife of the applicant is co-accused in the same FIR and therefore, otherwise also cannot stand as surety for the applicant. He further submits that applicant engaged a private advocate at the time of consideration of the bail application which suggests that he has sufficient financial resources. He submits that there is every possibility that upon being released on a petty surety amount, the applicant may abscond and may not be available during the trial.

5. Admittedly, the bail order was passed four months back and applicant has not been able to furnish the bail bond indicating that he is not in a position to arrange the surety amount to the tune of Rs. 30,000/-. Considering that he has remained in custody for four months despite the grant of bail, in the interest of justice the application is allowed and the surety amount of is reduced from 30,000/- to Rs. 20,000/-.

6. The remaining condition of the bail shall remain the same.

7. The application accordingly stands disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

NOVEMBER 13, 2025/lks/ma