



\$~6

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 471/2025 & CRL.M.A. 3322-3324/2025**

ARSHAD @ SHAHRUKH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Preetika Dwivedi and Mr.
Abhishek Mohanty, Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

12.03.2025

1. The present application has been filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) seeking regular bail in the FIR No. 502/2023 registered under Sections 302/120B/201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Arms Act) at Police Station (P.S.) Adarsh Nagar dated 25.06.2023.

Brief Facts

2. As per the case of the prosecution as set out in the Status Report, on 24.06.2023 at around 11:12 PM an information was received at PS Adarsh Nagar which was lodged vide DD No. 115A. It is stated that as per the said information a person in a Car¹ at Road No. 51, Near Shani Mandir, Azadpur had been shot by some persons who were riding on a two-wheeler² (Scooty).

¹ White Coloured Hyundai i10 Car with registration No. DL-7CJ-7153.

² Black N Torq Scooty.



It is stated that no further information about the Scooty was given by the informer.

2.1. It is stated that SI³ Rahul along with Ct.⁴ Bhupender reached the spot of the incident and found a Car which had collided with the divider on the road. It is stated that a bullet impact mark was found on the driver side door between the window panels. It is stated that the driver side window was shattered and glass pieces with blood stains were found lying in and out of the said Car. It is stated that the injured had already been taken to Max Hospital⁵ by some persons present at the place of incidence.

2.2. It is stated that crime team was called at the spot and after requisite formalities seizures of evidences was done vide seizure memos.

2.3. It is stated that SI then reached Max Hospital and collected the MLC of the victim and as per the said MLC victim was identified as one Tanish⁶, aged 26 years. It is stated that at that stage the victim/Tanish was not in the condition of giving statement. It is stated that the doctor handed over to the SI victim's clothes etc., which were sealed and seized.

2.4. It is stated that thereafter, the captioned FIR was registered under Section 307 of the IPC and Sections 27/54/59 of the Arms Act. It is stated that on 25.06.2023 at 6:30 AM the Max Hospital informed that the victim/Tanish succumbed to his injuries. It is stated that consequently, Section 307 of the IPC was substituted by Section 302 of the IPC in the captioned FIR.

³ Sub Inspector.

⁴ Constable

⁵ Max Hospital, Shalimar Bagh, Delhi.

⁶ Tanish Upadhyay.



2.5. It is stated that during investigation one eye witness i.e., Vinod Sharma's came forward and his statement was recorded under Section 161 of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (Cr.P.C.), wherein he stated that on 24.06.2023 at 10:45 PM he saw a white i10 Hyundai Car moving slowly due to heavy traffic. He stated that three (3) boys riding on a Scooty approached the Car and two (2) of the said boys started firing at the driver of the said Car. He stated that thereafter the said Car collided with the divider of the road. He stated that the assailants i.e., the two (2) boys fired around 10-12 rounds and shouted '*We have avenged Shamshad. His brothers are still alive*'. He stated that after the incident of firing the said boys fled towards Mukundpur. He states that the boys on the Scooty were aged between 16 to 18 years and he can identify if shown.

2.6. It is stated that as per the said eye witness three (3) persons took victim/Tanish in an auto rickshaw to the Hospital i.e., Max Hospital. It is stated that the statement of the eye witness i.e., Vinod Sharma was corroborated by statement of other witnesses i.e., Jaskaran⁷ and Devi Prasad.

2.7. It is stated that a secret informer informed the concerned SI that a person named Akbar had information about the said three (3) boys who were involved in the commission of crime. It is stated that Akbar was presented before the Inspector Rajender Singh, who interrogated Akbar. It is stated that Akbar disclosed that his nephew i.e., Applicant/Arshad⁸ herein had sent the said 3-4 boys involved in the commission of the crime to the Village Kherpur, Bulandshahr, Uttar Pradesh.

⁷ Jaskaran @ Jassi.

⁸ Arshad alias Shahrukh.



2.8. It is stated that Akbar further informed that victim/Tanish had a quarrel with one Shamshad and his associates on 07.01.2023 regarding which an FIR No. 15/2023 was registered under Sections 323/341/34 of the IPC at PS Adarsh Nagar at the instance of victim/Tanish. It is stated that on the same day victim/Tanish and his associates had retaliated by beating Shamshad in Jahangirpuri, Delhi regarding which an FIR No. 17/2023 under Sections 307/34 of the IPC was registered at PS Jahangirpuri. It is stated that since then Shamshad has been bedridden.

2.9. It is stated that during investigation name of one Rashid came to light who was found to be brother Shamshad. It is stated that Rashid was apprehended and he disclosed that Shamshad was in coma and seeing his miserable condition, Rashid along with his uncle Akbar, the Applicant/Arshad and one Ravi planned to avenge the wrong done to Shamshad and decided to kill victim/Tanish.

2.10. It is stated that as per their plan Akbar and Rashid thought of engaging young boys (under the age of 18 years) for killing victim/Tanish since the ensuing consequences would not be that grave for those under-aged boys. It is stated that in pursuance of the said plan they engaged Himanshu⁹, Ashish¹⁰, Uday¹¹, Shiva and Ankit¹² for the killing of victim/Tanish. It is stated that for the said purpose Rashid along with his uncle Akbar also provided the said boys with two (2) pistols and two (2)

⁹ Himanshu Dahiya.

¹⁰ Ashish Agri.

¹¹ Uday Singh Solanki.

¹² Ankit Bhardwaj.



*Kattas*¹³. It is stated that the said two (2) pistols and two (2) *Kattas* were given to Uday, Ashish, Ankit and Himanshu to kill Tanish.

2.11. It is stated that Ashish, Himanshu and Ankit were witnesses of prior assault committed on Shamshad by victim/Tanish and his associates and all of the said boys were friends of Shamshad.

2.12. It is stated that Rashid procured five (5) SIM cards from West Bengal in furtherance of execution of the plan and used the said SIM cards for inter-se communication while doing recce and other allied activities.

2.13. It is stated that basing reliance on the disclosure statement of Rashid Section 120B IPC was also added to the FIR.

2.14. It is stated that Rashid further disclosed in his statement that Rashid, Akbar and the Applicant herein did recce on victim/Tanish and identified his white i-10 Hyundai Car. It is stated that the Scooty used in the commission of crime belonged to Rashid.

2.15. It is stated that on the basis of the said information the police conducted raids in Bulandshar and apprehended four (4) CCLs¹⁴. It is stated that they were identified by Akbar to be Himanshu, Ashish, Uday and Ankit. It is stated that all the four (4) CCLs during the formal interrogation, confessed to their involvement in the commission of crime i.e., killing of victim/Tanish. It is stated that all the four (4) CCLs were presented before the Juvenile Justice Board (JJB).

2.16. It is stated that thereafter another CCL i.e., Shiva was also apprehended later. It is stated that Shiva disclosed that on 24.06.2023 all the 5 CCLs met at the water plant of Akbar where, Akbar provided *Kattas* to

¹³ Country made pistol.

¹⁴ Child in Conflict with Law.



Ankit and Ashish and pistols were provided to Himanshu and Uday. It is stated that Shiva further disclosed that on 24.06.2023 Ravi left on his Jupiter Scooty with Applicant/Arshad to do recce on victim/Tanish. It is stated that CCL Shiva left with CCL Ankit on his Activa Scooty to do recce on victim/Tanish. It is stated that Rashid's Scooty (used in the commission of crime) was being driven by CCL Ashish with CCL Himanshu and CCL Uday as pillion riders, when the victim was shot.

2.17. It is stated that on 25.06.2023 accused Ravi was arrested. It is stated that Ravi confessed to the involvement in the commission of crime. It is stated that from his possession, two (2) *Kattas*, two (2) pistols, eight (8) live cartridges, Scooty¹⁵, were recovered.

2.18. It is stated that the Applicant/Arshaa was arrested on 29.06.2023. It is stated that Applicant disclosed during interrogation that Akbar had assigned him and Ravi the task of recce of victim/Tanish. It is stated that Akbar had given them a keypad phone for communication. It is stated that Applicant further disclosed that he had broken the said phone and thrown it away after the commission of crime. It is stated that after the incident Applicant/Arshad fled to Agra.

2.19. It is stated that from the CCTV of spot of incident it was found that on 24.06.2023 all the accused persons and CCLs were gathering/roaming around, they were also seen breaking the mobile phone. It is stated that CCLs were boarded on a Ertiga Car¹⁶ to be sent to Uttar Pradesh after the commission of crime.

¹⁵ Scooty with registration No. DL 8SBW7250.

¹⁶ Ertiga Car with registration No. DL 6CT1887.



2.20. It is stated that exhibits of the present case were sent to FSL¹⁷ Rohini for expert opinion on CCTV and mobile phones, but report has yet not been received.

Arguments of the Applicant

3. Learned counsel for the Applicant contends that in the CCTV footage of the incident obtained by the police, the Applicant is not seen anywhere and cannot be identified.

3.1. She states in the confessional statements of Akbar, Rashid and Ravi, the only role ascribed to the Applicant is that of doing recce of victim/Tanish.

3.2. She states that the assertion in the charge-sheet and the status report that co-accused Akbar disclosed that after commission of the offence Applicant/Arshad assisted the 3-4 CCLs in absconding to UP is misleading and contrary to the Section 161 Cr.P.C. statement of Akbar. She states that on the other hand, co-accused Akbar in his statement had allegedly stated that it was Akbar, who made arrangements for the CCLs to abscond to UP.

3.3. She states that the arrest of the Applicant was in complete contravention of the guidelines issued in the case of **DK Basu v. State of West Bengal**¹⁸ as no independent witness was mentioned in the arrest memo prepared in terms of Section 41B of the Cr.P.C. She states that as per the statement of Akbar, the Applicant was hiding in Meerut, while he was arrested from Agra, which shows inconsistency in the case setup by the prosecution qua the Applicant.

¹⁷ Forensic Science Laboratory.

¹⁸ (1997) 1 SCC 416.



3.4. She states that chargesheet against the Applicant and other co-accused was filed on 21.09.2023. She states that CDR data provided with the chargesheet, nowhere shows that assailants were in touch with Applicant during and/or before the commission of crime.

3.5. She states that other accused have already been enlarged on bail by the JJB vide order dated 10.10.2023.

3.6. She states that Applicant had earlier filed bail application before the Trial Court which was dismissed vide order dated 16.04.2024.

3.7. She states that thereafter an application for regular bail was also moved before this Court which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 23.10.2024 in Bail Appl No. 2778/2024, with liberty reserved to file again. She states that the bail application was withdrawn as prosecution had contended that FSL Report of the mobile phone of co-accused Akbar is awaited. She states that the Court had directed that FSL Report be filed within six (6) weeks. She states that however, despite passage of over 4½ months the said report is still awaited.

3.8. She states that the Trial is moving at snail's pace and will take considerable time for completion. She states that chargesheet has already been filed and till date the matter has only been taken up thrice by the Trial Court. She states that charges have not been framed yet as the FSL report for CCTV and mobile data of co-accused Akbar has been produced yet.

3.9. She states that the Applicant has been in jail for 1 Year, 07 Months and 28 Days as on 27.02.2025 as per the Nominal Roll. She states that the conduct of the Applicant in the jail as per the Nominal Roll has been satisfactory. She states that the Applicant does not have any criminal priors and is of young age aged 26 years.



Arguments of the State

4. In reply, Mr. Khanna, learned APP states that the allegations against the Applicant are very serious in nature. He states that the charges in the present matter are yet to be framed.

4.1. He states that there are total of 37 witnesses of the main chargesheet and 3 witnesses of supplementary chargesheet who will have to be examined.

4.2. He states that the FSL report of the CCTV and mobile data of co-accused Akbar is still awaited. He states on instructions from the IO that no priority letter was issued to Director, FSL after passing of the order dated 23.10.2024.

4.3. He states that the next date of hearing before the Trial Court is fixed for 18.03.2025 for filing of supplementary chargesheet; however, charges will not be framed until the FSL report is received and filed.

4.4. He fairly states that there is no CDR data of the Applicant/Arshad filed with the main chargesheet to corroborate his involvement.

4.5. He states that the main conspirators are co-accused Akbar and Rashid, who procure the weapons, engaged the CCLs and provided the Scooty used in the commission of the offence.

4.6. He states that as per the evidence on record, the role of the Applicant/Arshad is of carrying out recce on victim/Tanish. He states, however, Section 120-B IPC has been invoked the role of the Applicant is grave and the crime committed is serious.

Analysis and Findings

5. This Court has heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the records.



6. Before adverting to the analysis of the facts of the present case, it would be apposite to refer to the factors which are to be taken into consideration for granting bail to an accused similarly placed to the Applicant herein and in the peculiar facts of the present case.

6.1 The Supreme Court in the case of **Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh v. State of Maharashtra & Anr.**¹⁹ while dealing with a challenge to an order declining grant of bail to an accused in connection with the alleged offence committed under Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967; after considering the period of incarceration, pace of trial (i.e., charges having not been framed) and number of witnesses yet to be examined, held that no matter how serious the crime alleged to have been committed, the accused has a right to speedy trial as enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The relevant paragraphs of the said judgement read as under:

“6. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and having gone through the materials on record, we are inclined to exercise our discretion in favour of the appellant herein keeping in mind the following aspects:

- (i) The **appellant is in jail as an undertrial prisoner** past four years;
- (ii) **Till this date, the trial court has not been able to even proceed to frame charge;** and
- (iii) As pointed out by the counsel appearing for the State as well as NIA, **the prosecution intends to examine not less than eighty witnesses.**

7. **Having regard to the aforesaid, we wonder by what period of time, the trial will ultimately conclude. Howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has a right to speedy trial as enshrined under the Constitution of India.** Over a period of time, the trial courts and the High Courts have forgotten a very well-settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment.

¹⁹ (2024) 9 SCC 813.



9. The same principle has been reiterated by this Court in *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab* [*Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565 : 1980 SCC (Cri) 465] that the object of bail is to secure the attendance of the accused at the trial, that the proper test to be applied in the solution of the question whether bail should be granted or refused is whether it is probable that the party will appear to take his trial and that it is indisputable that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment.

16. Criminals are not born but made. The human potential in everyone is good and so, never write off any criminal as beyond redemption. This humanist fundamental is often missed when dealing with delinquents, juvenile and adult. Indeed, every saint has a past and every sinner a future. When a crime is committed, a variety of factors is responsible for making the offender commit the crime. Those factors may be social and economic, may be, the result of value erosion or parental neglect; may be, because of the stress of circumstances, or the manifestation of temptations in a milieu of affluence contrasted with indigence or other privations.

17. **If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.**

18. We may hasten to add that the petitioner is still an accused; not a convict. The over-arching postulate of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty cannot be brushed aside lightly, howsoever stringent the penal law may be.”

(Emphasis supplied)

6.2 The Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI²⁰**, observed as follows:

“12.The principle that bail is the rule and jail is the exception has been well recognised through the repetitive pronouncements of this

²⁰ (2022) 10 SCC 51.



Court. This again is on the touchstone of Article 21 of the Constitution of India...”

(Emphasis supplied)

6.3 A coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Ashok Sagar v. State**²¹ has summarized the principle for granting bail in matter which involve serious/heinous offences. The relevant paragraph of the said judgment reads as under:

“35. The principles governing exercise of judicial discretion in such cases, appear, however, to be well-settled. The following principles may immediately be discerned, from the aforementioned authorities:

.....

(ii) While examining the issue, courts are **not to presume** that the accused would flee justice, were he to be released, and search for evidence indicating to the contrary. Logistically, every accused, who is released during trial, has the potentiality of fleeing. Were this potentiality to be allowed to influence the mind of the court, no accused would be entitled to bail.

.....

(iv) **Given this legal position, the nature of the offence committed necessarily has a limited role to play, while examining the merits of an application for bail.....**

(v) Where, however, the material against the accused is so insubstantial that the court feels that his conviction, in the ultimate eventuate, appears remote, the court can legitimately arrive at a conclusion that, as the accused is highly unlikely to ultimately suffer conviction, his incarceration during trial, would be unjustified.

(vi) Having said that, the decisions cited hereinabove reveal that the Supreme Court has, in certain cases, treated the seriousness of the offence alleged against the accused seeking bail, to be a relevant consideration while examining the merit of his application. **While it may be true that, in extremely**

²¹ 2018 SCC OnLine Del 9548.



gross cases, the advisability of allowing the accused to roam at large, during the course of his trial, may be questionable, the court has, nevertheless, to be alive to the fact that, at that stage, the charge against the accused is still in the realm of an accusation, and no more. It would be entirely impermissible for the court, at the stage of deciding the bail application of the accused, to subject him to a premature trial, far less to return any finding, even tentative, regarding the justifiability of the charge against him.
.....”

(Emphasis supplied)

7. At the outset, it is noted that the allegation in the status report that co-accused Akbar has disclosed that Applicant/Arshad assisted the CCLs to abscond to UP after commission of offence is incorrect and is not borne out from Section 161 Cr.P.C. statement, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the Applicant.

8. Keeping in view the above, the incriminating circumstances pressed against the Applicant herein are: (i) Disclosure statement of co-accused Akbar wherein he allegedly mentioned that Applicant assisted in conducting a recce of the victim; (ii) Disclosure statement of co-accused Rashid wherein he mentioned that he along with Akbar, Applicant and Ravi started planning to kill victim/Tanish; (iii) Disclosure statement of CCL Shiva wherein he disclosed that he along with other co-accused including Applicant gathered at Akbar's water plant. He had further disclosed that co-accused Ravi left on his Scooty with the Applicant to do recce of victim/Tanish; (iv) Disclosure statement of Applicant to the effect that Applicant and co-accused Ravi were entrusted with the task of recce of victim/Tanish; he further disclosed that he broke the mobile phone provided by co-accused Akbar after the commission



of crime; (v) That all the accused persons including Applicant are seen in CCTV footage.

8.1. In the disclosure statements of the accused persons and assailants (i.e., CCLs) the only role ascribed to the Applicant is that of doing recce of the victim Tanish. This Court has gone through the disclosure statements of accused persons Akbar, Rashid and Ravi and finds mention of no other role being ascribed to the Applicant, than that of doing recce of victim/Tanish in furtherance of the intention to kill the victim.

8.2. In the Status Report and the main chargesheet there is a mention of the fact that co-accused Akbar disclosed that Applicant/Arshad had sent 3-4 boys (CCLs) to Village Khairpur Bulandshahr, UP; however, this does not find mention in the statement of co-accused Akbar recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C.

8.3. It is trite law that the probative value of the said disclosure statements will be considered and tested during trial after evaluating the corroborative evidence led by prosecution and the same cannot have a bearing on the present bail application of the Applicant. (Re: **Toofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu**²²)

9. The prosecution has raised a plea that Applicant herein has been identified in the CCTV footage of the spot of incident. The learned APP submitted that in the said CCTV footage the accused persons can be seen gathering and roaming at the said spot of incident. The learned APP further submitted that the CCTV footage has been sent to FSL Rohini for expert opinion and the report of the same has yet not been received. In contrast, the learned counsel for the Applicant has vehemently disputed this fact and



stated that Applicant cannot be seen in the CCTV footage filed with the charge-sheet. The learned APP was unable to rebut the submission of the learned counsel of the Applicant. Therefore, the fact whether Applicant is visible or not in the CCTV footage is a seriously disputed fact (and not a bare denial) and will be decided by the Trial Court after considering the evidence led.

10. It is a matter of record that there is no CDRs filed with the charge-sheet to prove the presence of the Applicant on the date of the incident with the other co-accused persons. At the stage of bail, this fact would have to be considered in favour of the Applicant, since there is no other corroborative evidence to establish the involvement of the Applicant.

11. The prosecution is still awaiting the mobile data from the mobile phone of co-accused Akbar to examine if the data would provide incriminating evidence against the Applicant and other co-accused. However, the said data has not been provided by FSL till date (after nearly 1 year and 9 months). The Applicant herein on an earlier occasion had filed a Bail APPL No. 2778/2024, wherein a co-ordinate bench of this Court vide order dated 23.10.2024 disposed of the said bail application to await the FSL report. The Court further directed the Director, FSL to forward the FSL report to the investigating agency within a period of six (6) weeks, the FSL report on mobile data. Admittedly, the said FSL report has yet not been received. It is therefore clear that delay in obtaining the FSL report by the prosecution cannot be made a ground or be read against the Applicant herein to deny him consideration of bail.

²² (2021) 4 SCC 1.



12. At this stage, it cannot be denied that there is no direct evidence (except disclosure statements) against the Applicant to show his participation in the conspiracy of shooting and consequent killing of the victim/Tanish by the Applicant.

13. Admittedly, no charges have been framed in the present case yet and as per the Status Report filed by the State there are 37 witnesses in the original chargesheet and 03 witnesses are proposed in supplementary chargesheet, who have to be examined. It is apparent the trial is likely to take a considerable period of time.

14. Perusal of the Nominal Roll dated 27.02.2025 would show that the Applicant has been in judicial custody for 01 Year 08 Months (approximately) as on date. Further the Applicant herein has no prior criminal antecedents, is of young age of 26 years and the conduct of the Applicant in the jail is satisfactory as per the said Nominal Roll.

15. This Court is not expressing any view on the nuanced aspects and merits of the matter as the same would-be subject matter of trial. However, having considered the prima facie role of the Applicant in the commission of the crime and the fact that the trial is likely to take some time, as also that the alleged chain of events pleaded by prosecution would have to be proved [by the prosecution] by leading reliable evidence to bring home the guilt of the Applicant and establish Applicant's culpability in the commission of offence, the Court is of the opinion that the Applicant is entitled to bail at this stage.

16. In the judgments noted above, the Supreme Court and this Court have reiterated and emphasized that the object of the jail is to secure the appearance of the accused for facing trial. The object is neither punitive nor



preventive and the deprivation of liberty has been considered as a punishment. However appropriate conditions ought to be put to assuage the apprehension of the accused tampering with the evidence or evading the trial.

17. In the light of the above, it would not be prudent to keep the Applicant behind the bars for an indefinite period awaiting the conclusion of trial and bringing home of guilt by the prosecution. This Court therefore, finds it to be a fit case for grant of bail. Consequently, the Applicant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- with one surety of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, further subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Applicant will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
- (ii) Applicant shall provide the details of the address to the Trial Court and the I.O., at which the Applicant shall be residing.
- (iii) Applicant shall appear before the Trial Court as and when the matter is taken up for hearing; and not seek any unnecessary adjournment.
- (iv) Applicant shall join investigation as and when called by the I.O. concerned.
- (v) Applicant shall provide all mobile numbers to the I.O. concerned which shall be kept in working condition at all times and shall not switch off or change the mobile number without prior intimation to the I.O. concerned.



(vi) Applicant will report to the concerned I.O. on every 1st and 3rd Thursday of every month, at 4:00 PM, and will not be kept waiting for more than an hour.

(vii) Applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not communicate with or come in contact with any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.

18. In the event of there being any FIR/DD-entry/Complaint lodged against the Applicant during the period of bail, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

19. Needless to state, but any observation touching the merits of the case is purely for the purposes of deciding the question of grant of bail and shall not be construed as an expression on merits of the matter.

20. Accordingly, this Bail Application is allowed and disposed of. Pending applications (if any) are disposed of as infructuous.

21. Copy of the order be sent to the Jail Superintendent for information and necessary compliance.

22. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

MARCH 12, 2025/sk

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)