



\$~4

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1059/2025**

DIPENDER

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Rana and Ms. Riya
Rana, Advs.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State
along with SI Rajat PS Ranholla.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

21.03.2025

CRL.M.A. 8001/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1059/2025

3. At the outset, it is stated by the learned counsel for the applicant, that the co-accused persons namely Anil, Dinesh and Pradeep in this case have already been granted anticipatory bail by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jasmeet Singh *vide* order dated 12.03.2025 in Bail Application Nos. 1041/2025, 1044/2025 and 1054/2025, who at the relevant time was holding the criminal roster, but due to change of Roster, the matter has been listed before this Court.
4. This Court has proceeded to deal with the present application in view of the order dated 07.02.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Writ



Petition (Criminal) No. 55/2025 titled ***Sehkhhar Prasad Mahto @ Shekhar Kushwaha v. The Registrar General Jharkhand High Court & Anr.***, wherein it was observed as under:-

“10. We, therefore, clarify that if in a particular High Court, the bail applications are assigned to different single Judge/Bench, in that event, all the applications arising out of same FIR should be placed before one learned Judge.

11.xxxxx

12.xxxxx.

13. Further, we expect that in order to maintain consistency in the views taken by the Court, the learned judge, who will hear the subsequent applications filed for bail, may give due weightage to the views taken by the earlier judge, who had dealt with the bail applications arising out of the same FIR.”

5. The applicant is seeking grant of anticipatory bail in FIR bearing no. 0148/2025 dated 16.02.2025, registered for offence under Sections 109(1)/115(2)/126(2)/351(2)/61(2)/3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, at Police Station Ranhola.

6. Brief facts, as discernible from the material placed on record are that on 15.02.2025, upon receiving information through DD No. 26A regarding a fight, a team of police officials had reached the scene of the incident at Government Girls Senior Secondary School, Baprola, Delhi. It was disclosed that a fight had broken out between members of two families, who already had a history of land dispute going on. Thereafter, FIR No.0150/2025 came to be registered along with a cross FIR No. 0148/2025. The allegations in both the FIRs were similar, that the two factions of individuals had beaten each other with *lathis* and pelted stones as well. Most of the injuries were simple in nature, except for one person namely Sandeep, who had suffered grievous injuries.

7. It is informed that the parties have arrived at a compromise dated



21.02.2025, wherein the members of both the groups have settled their disputes and they do not wish to pursue the FIR any further. They have also agreed to cooperate in quashing of the FIRs.

8. A perusal of the order passed by the Coordinate Bench in case of co-accused persons reveals that the complainant had given no objection to grant of anticipatory bail to co-accused persons.

9. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in arresting the present applicant since the parties have arrived at a voluntary settlement and have settled their disputes. Thus, it is a fit case to grant anticipatory bail.

10. While granting anticipatory bail to co-accused persons, the Coordinate Bench had observed as under:

“However, this Court is of the view that the police machinery has been put in motion on account of the acts of commission & omission on behalf of the petitioners and useful time of the police which could have been utilised for important matters has been misdirected towards the present case. Issues such as these end up wasting precious judicial time and state resources, ultimately affecting the society at large and negatively impacting judicial productivity. Hence the petitioners must pay some costs”.

11. Today also, the learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant shall voluntarily make a donation to the Delhi Police Welfare Society Fund. Hence, the applicant shall deposit a sum of Rs. 5,000/- to Delhi Police Welfare Society Fund within two weeks from today.

12. Since the matter has been settled, the application is allowed and in even of arrest, the applicant be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned IO/SHO, subject to the following further conditions:-



- (i) At the time of furnishing bail bond, the applicant shall provide the mobile number, which he undertakes to keep operational at all times during the pendency of the trial.
 - (ii) The applicant shall inform the concerned Investigating Officer about his current residential address.
 - (iii) In case of change of residential addresses/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned IO/SHO.
 - (iv) The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when asked.
13. The application stands disposed of.
14. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

MARCH 21, 2025/A

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

Click here to check corrigendum, if any