



\$~82

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1522/2025**

RAVINDER @ RAVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vibhas Kumar Jha and Mr.
Yogesh Kumar, Advocates

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State
with Mr. Praveen Kumar Goyal,
Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

27.05.2025

%

1. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No. 408/2019, registered at Police Station Kanjhawala, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 302/201/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC').
2. The brief facts of the case are that in the intervening night of 10-11.10.2019, a PCR call was received at PS Ghevra regarding a quarrel having taken place near Old Shiv Mandir, Ghevra, Delhi, which was recorded *vide* DD No. 6A dated 11.10.2019, and the police officials had reached the spot i.e. House No. 216, opposite Old Shiv Temple, Ghevra, where bloodstains were found inside the room, outside the room, and in the bathroom. Three empty cartridges and one bullet lead were recovered from the room, and one live cartridge was found outside the room. It was found



that the injured had already been shifted to the hospital. Subsequently, information was received from Sri Balaji Action Medical Institute, Paschim Vihar, regarding the death of the injured Sahil, which was recorded at the police station *vide* DD No. 9A. Upon receipt of this information, SI Anil Kumar had reached the hospital and thereafter revisited the crime scene. The statement of Rai Singh, grandfather of the deceased, was recorded, who stated that on the night of the incident, the deceased Sahil was sleeping alone in an adjacent room, while the complainant, his wife, sister, and grandson Kardam were sleeping together in another room. At around 01:15 AM, on hearing the sound of gunfire, the complainant had rushed to Sahil's room and saw two persons fleeing by climbing the boundary wall. The deceased, in a bleeding condition, had come out of the room. Kardam had chased the fleeing persons, who had escaped with their associates waiting on a motorcycle in the lane. The deceased was thereafter taken to the hospital, where he was declared brought dead.

3. During investigation, co-accused Sahil Rana was apprehended who disclosed that he had a monetary dispute with the deceased and he had come into contact with other individuals who also had financial issues with the deceased. Due to these strained relations, the applicant/accused Ravinder @ Ravi had allegedly hatched a conspiracy to eliminate the deceased and provided arms and ammunition to co-accused Sahil Rana and others. In execution of the plan, Sahil Rana, along with co-accused Sajeev @ Dassi and Vijay Sharma @ Sudama, had gone to the house of the deceased and shot him using country-made pistols, resulting in his death.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of applicant argues that the applicant herein has been in judicial custody since 06.08.2020, even though



he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the applicant was not present at the spot and there is no direct evidence to link to present applicant to the alleged offence in question. It is also contended that the applicant herein had been granted interim bail for 10 days on medical grounds and he had surrendered on time before the jail authorities. The learned counsel further argues that the applicant is handicap, having 45% disability of his legs. It is further argued that co-accused Sahil Rana, who had allegedly shot the deceased, has been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 04.03.2025, which has been annexed as Annexure P-4. It is submitted that as of today, only 16 witnesses have been examined out of 31 witnesses, including four public witnesses and it does not seem that the trial will conclude in the near future. Moreover, the FSL result is pending since October, 2019, and further, the eye witnesses have not identified the applicant herein. Thus, it is prayed that the applicant herein be released on regular bail.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State argues that the present applicant is the main conspirator in this case, who had supplied arms to the co-accused persons. It is further submitted that the applicant is also involved in two other cases i.e. (i) FIR No. 28/2020, registered at Police Station Vijay Vihar, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 393/394/397/34 of IPC and (ii) FIR No. 206/2020, registered at Police Station Budh Vihar, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act. It is contended that the applicant can jump the bail and influence the prosecution witnesses, and therefore, the present bail application be dismissed.

6. This Court has **heard** arguments advanced on behalf of both the sides



and has perused the record.

7. In the present case, the allegations against the applicant are that he was having some financial dispute with deceased and as the deceased was not returning his money, the applicant had hatched a conspiracy to kill the deceased and for the said purpose, he had provided arms to the co-accused persons.

8. This Court's attention however has been drawn to the order dated 04.03.2025 passed by the Coordinate Bench in Bail Application No. 57/2025, *vide* which the co-accused Sahil Rana, who had allegedly shot the deceased on the day of incident, has been granted regular bail. In the said order, the Coordinate Bench has taken note of the fact that eye witnesses had not identified the co-accused Sahil and that trial would take time to conclude.

9. As per the Nominal Roll dated 23.05.2025, the applicant/accused has already undergone incarceration for a period of 4 years 09 months 05 days. As informed, there are about 31 prosecution witnesses in this case, but only about 16 witnesses have been examined so far, out of which the eye-witnesses (PW-1 and PW-13) have not identified the present applicant. The trial therefore will take some time to conclude.

10. Thus, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the present applicant/accused had been earlier granted interim bail for 10 days which he had not misused, and further that he is having 45% disability in his legs, and also that co-accused Sahil Rana has been granted regular bail by the Coordinate Bench *inter alia* on the ground of delay in trial, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant herein, on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.15,000/- with one surety of the



like amount, after verification of the address of the accused/applicant as well as his surety, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms and conditions:

- i) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court and if the applicant has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the concerned trial court.
- ii) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court and IO/SHO concerned.
- iii) The applicant shall appear regularly before the learned Trial Court, unless exempted.
- iv) The applicant shall appear in Court on every date of hearing unless exempted;
- v) The applicant shall not communicate with, or come into contact with the complainant or any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.

11. Accordingly, the present bail application stands allowed and is disposed of.

12. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

13. A copy of this order be communicated to the concerned jail authorities for necessary compliance.

14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 27, 2025/ns

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