



\$~4

*

+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
BAIL APPLN. 923/2025

TANVEER KHAN

.....Applicant

Through: Ms. Nusrat Hussain, Adv.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri,
APP for the State with Ms.
Divya Yadav & Mr. Lalit
Luthra. Advs.

Inspector Om Prakash, PS-
Vivek Vihar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

28.04.2025

%

1. The present application is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 304/2020 dated 07.11.2020, registered at Police Station Vivek Vihar, for the offence under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').

2. The present FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Poonam, who is allegedly the eye witness to the incident. It is alleged that there was some prior dispute over the Ashram, earlier belonging to one Hazi Kallo, which had devolved upon her disciples—the complainant and one Devi, after her demise. It is alleged that the applicant got the electricity connection transferred in the name of Devi with an intent to grab the Ashram after her death. The victim was a disciple of the complainant. On 07.11.2020, when the complainant along with the victim and another disciple Nishi (PW4) went to meet Devi, the applicant allegedly came running with a knife and caught hold of the victim. It is alleged that the applicant also shouted to kill the victim, whereafter, the other accused persons also came with knives and stabbed the victim. It is alleged that the applicant



was nabbed on the spot with the help of public.

3. At the outset, it is pointed out that 13 out of 27 prosecution witnesses have already been examined.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State submits that the eye witnesses– PW1 (the complainant) and PW4, have duly supported the case of the prosecution and only official witnesses are left to be examined. He submits that the trial is at the fag end and he is hopeful that the remaining witnesses will be examined expeditiously.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant contests that there are material discrepancies in the evidence of the alleged eye witnesses.

6. The offence as alleged against the applicant is grave in nature and supported by eye witnesses. While it is argued that there are substantial contradictions in the evidence of the eye witnesses, considering the stage of the trial and that only official witnesses remain to be examined, this Court does not consider it apposite to minutely examine the evidence and entertain the present application at this stage.

7. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the applicant requests that the trial may be expedited considering that the applicant has been in custody for around four years.

8. Considering the same, the learned Trial Court is requested to expedite the trial and complete recording of evidence of the remaining witnesses within a period of six to eight months.

9. The application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

10. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 28, 2025/“SS”