



\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ BAIL APPLN. 1468/2025 & CRL.M.A. 26236/2025 FOR TAKING
ON RECORD OF ADDL. DOCUMENTS.

JUMMAN @ JUMMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Jyoti Sharma and Ms. Samidha
Jain, Adv.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with Insp.
Sandeep, P.S.Ranhola.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **12.11.2025**

BAIL APPLN. 1468/2025

1. This is an application under Section 483 Cr.P.C. read with Section 528 BNSS for grant of regular bail filed on behalf of the petitioner Jumman @ Jumma in case FIR no. 449/2022 under Section 302/120B/34 IPC, PS Ranhola.
2. The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that investigation is complete and charge sheet has already been filed in Court and therefore, petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.
3. It is submitted that petitioner is in custody since 20.05.2022. He was released on interim bail but did not misuse the liberty of bail and surrendered himself before the Jail Authority after the expiry of period of interim bail.



4. On merits, it is submitted that there is no evidence against the present petitioner inasmuch as the FSL result and chance print report does not support the prosecution version and petitioner is not visible in the CCTV footage of the incident.

5. *Per contra*, Ld. APP for the State has opposed the bail application submitting that petitioner is the hired killer who committed the murder at the instance of Chandra Kala, co-accused for a consideration of Rs. 70,000/-. She further submits that despite the fact that the petitioner was in muffled face, he has been identified in Court by PW-2 Pradeep Verma on the basis of body physique (*chaal chalan dekh kar*). However, she fairly admits that the remaining evidence does not support the prosecution version as the FSL result has found that there is no blood on the axe and the chance print recovered from the spot do not match with finger prints of the petitioner. She submits that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature and therefore, petitioner is not entitled for the grant of bail.

6. As per the prosecution story, on receipt of information vide DD no. 14A, the police team reached the second floor of RZ-70, Gali no. 1, Deep Enclave, Part-II, Vikash Nagar where a man later identified as Veer Bahadur Verma was found lying injured. The blood was oozing from his head. There were marks of injuries on his head behind the right side of the ear and lot of blood was lying on the floor. The injured was rushed to the hospital where he was declared brought dead by the doctor.

7. No eye witness was found at the spot. The CCTV footage was checked and the statement of Akash, son of Veer Bahadur was recorded which revealed that victim had performed the second marriage with Chandra Kala and for whom he had arranged a separate house and opened a shop in



the name of Balaji Cloth which was being run by Chandra Kala.

8. He further stated that on 17.05.2022, the deceased left home saying that he was going to Chandra Kala's house to get the committee money. After taking the committee money he stayed with Chandra Kala in the night of 17-18.05.2022 and about 1:30 AM in the night he got a call from Chandra Kala that his father was killed by thieves.

9. During investigation, the CCTV footage was examined and upon analysis, it was found that about 10-12 minute before the incident, a person was seen entering the house no. RZ-70, Gali No. 1, Deep Enclave, Vikash Nagar, Delhi and after about 8-9 minutes he was seen coming out of the house with a bag. Finding the situation suspicious from the CCTV footage, the investigation was carried out by involving Chandra Kala, Akash and Pradeep Verma separately. During interrogation they identified the petitioner as brother of one Nargis who used to work at Chandra Kala's shop.

10. On interrogation Chandra Kala confessed her crime and told that she had got her husband killed by giving money to the petitioner Jumman @ Jumma, brother of Nargis. She confessed that she had opened the main gate and gave entry to the petitioner. During investigation the petitioner got recovered a small axe which is alleged to be the weapon of offence from his house.

11. The exhibits were sent to the FSL. The FSL result has been placed before the Court. No blood has been detected on the axe.

12. The Ld. APP fairly states that the FSL result and the chance print report are not supporting the prosecution case. As admitted by the Ld. APP also, the only evidence against the present petitioner is the CCTV footage.



13. The attention of the Court has been drawn to the testimony of PW-2 Pradeep Verma who was shown the CCTV footage and as per his testimony the intruder is seen in a muffled face. However, he deposed that he identifies him by body physique (*chaal chalan dekh kar*). The evidentiary value of such identification is to be determined by the Trial Court after appreciation of the evidence at the final stage and therefore, it would not be appropriate to make any comment at this stage regarding the same.

14. Besides the evidence of identification of PW-2 on the basis of CCTV footage in which the intruder is seen in muffled face, there is no other evidence against the present petitioner. Co-accused Chandra Kala has since been enlarged on bail. The petitioner is stated to be in custody since last about three and a half years. It is submitted that till date only 8 witnesses out of 32 witnesses cited by the prosecution are examined and therefore, there is no possibility of trial concluding in near future.

15. Hence, keeping in view, the entirety of facts and circumstances, the nature and quality of evidence, the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last about three and a half years and majority of witnesses still remain to be examined as also the fact that co-accused Chandra Kala has since been enlarged on bail on 29.01.2025, petitioner is admitted to bail upon his furnishing a personal bond of a sum of Rs. 30,000/- with a surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Ld. Trial Court/ Duty Magistrate subject to the following condition:

- a. The petitioner shall not try to contact any of the prosecution witnesses or threaten or intimidate them;
- b. That upon being released on bail the petitioner shall share his permanent address and mobile phone number with the



investigating officer and shall keep the mobile phone operational throughout;

c. That the petitioner shall cooperate with the trial and shall not indulge in any other criminal act.

16. The bail application is accordingly allowed. The copy of this order be sent to the Superintendent Jail for information and compliance.

17. Nothing stated herein shall tantamount to be an expression in the merits of the case.

18. The application along with pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

NOVEMBER 12, 2025/lks/na