



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 721/2025**

ARUN RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Manoj Godara, Advocate (VC)

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

23.07.2025

%

1. The applicant/accused seeks bail in FIR bearing No. 226/2022 registered at Police Station Mohan Garden for offences punishable under Sections 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ("IPC") and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 ("Arms Act").

2. Per FIR, it is stated therein that on 20.03.2023 at about 7:10 PM, three persons entered the office of the complainant, Rajendra Prasad Gupta, at L-23/5, Rama Park Road, Mohan Garden, Delhi, and demanded Rs. 1 crore stating that they had been sent by one Kala Jathedi. Upon the complainant's denial of any knowledge of such person, one of the assailants fired a shot at him, causing bullet fragment injuries to both his legs. The assailants, all aged between 20-28 years, then fled. Upon receipt of PCR call DD No. 89A, the police reached the spot and recovered one empty shell and two bullet lead pieces, which were seized. The complainant was found undergoing treatment at Ayushman Hospital, and MLC No. 1059/22

BAIL APPLN. 721/2025

Page 1 of 4



recorded firearm injuries as alleged.

3. In course of investigation, applicant was arrested on 23.12.2022 and has been in judicial custody since then, amounting to approximately two years of detention.

4. Heard and perused the case file.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant argues that applicant has already undergone prolonged period of incarceration, and there is no likelihood of the applicant's conviction.

5.1. He points out that on 24.02.2024, the applicant had earlier also filed a bail application before this Court. The same was dismissed as withdrawn with a direction to the learned Trial Court for expeditious trial. However, despite such directions, no substantial progress has been made in the trial proceedings.

5.2. He further urges that the applicant's purported involvement and role attributed to him was limited to safeguarding the co-accused and did not entail any active participation. The prosecution's own version assigns the applicant a very peripheral role. The applicant is being unfairly targeted without substantive evidence linking him to the alleged offense, he would further urge.

6. *Per contra*, stand taken by the learned APP appearing for the prosecution/State is that the applicant is an active member of the transnational Lawrence Bishnoi-Kala Jathedi-Goldy Brar gang.

6.1. As per statement under section 161 Cr.P.C. of witness Rahul r/o village Bajghera, Delhi, the applicant had also approached him to arrange the stay of arrested shooters and also hide their motorcycles used in the crime. The applicant had hidden both the motorcycles used in the crime at



his place in his village to save the shooters from this case. She submits that both the motorcycles used in the crime were recovered from his place in the village.

6.2. Not only the shooters thus stayed with the applicant, but even the two weapons used in the crime were recovered from him as recorded in FIR No. 376/2022, under Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, registered at P.S. Special Cell, Delhi.

6.3. Furthermore, she points out that the two shooters of this gang, of which applicant is a member, again threatened the complainant of the FIR in question, leading to another FIR No. 57/2023 dated 20.02.2023 under Sections 506, 507, 34 of IPC & 27 of the Arms Act, registered at P.S. Mohan Garden, Dwarka, Delhi.

6.4. She also submits that the main conspirator, Goldy Brar is yet to be arrested and that extradition proceedings are underway.

6.5. Learned APP states that even during the investigation, when efforts were made to apprehend the applicant, he remained absconding and evaded his arrest for long. Thus, in light of the gravity and seriousness of the offenses, the bail application be dismissed, she urges.

7. Having heard as above and upon perusal of the nominal roll, I am in agreement with submissions made by the learned APP.

8. Moreover, the antecedents of the applicant are quite chequered. He is involved in as many as 6 FIRs (even though, he is stated to be on bail in all the said cases).

9. Apart from the above, two of the co-accused are still absconding. None of the other arrested co-accused have been granted bail, since all of them are required to be confronted to each other in order to unearth the



conspiracy and involvement of all the kingpins.

10. At this stage, this does not thus seem a fit case for granting the concession of bail.

11. Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed.

ARUN MONGA, J

JULY 23, 2025

dy