



\$~13

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1517/2025**

PANDAV KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arup Banerjee, Mr. Shiv Pratap
Singh & Mr. Krishna Yadav,
Advocates

versus

THE N.C.T. OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP
with SI Ravinder, PS Rani Bagh

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

15.09.2025

%

1. This is an application for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 86/2024, under Section 302 IPC, PS Rani Bagh, filed on behalf of the petitioner.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations are totally false and baseless. He submits that no recovery has been affected from the possession of the petitioner. The alleged recovery of knife shown is planted, and till date, no FSL result has been filed to confirm the presence of the blood on the knife.
3. He further submits that investigation is complete and charge sheet has already been filed. The petitioner is in custody since 28.01.2024. There are 33 prosecution witnesses cited in the charge sheet and therefore trial may take long time to conclude.
4. Bail application has been opposed by the learned APP submitting that petitioner is accused of murder of a lady and there is a CCTV footage showing that he visited the scene of crime. The call detail record analysis



shows his presence at the spot. He further submits that the weapon of offence has been recovered at the instance of the present petitioner. According to him, the grandmother of the victim stated in her statement that the victim was in relationship with the present petitioner and the motive for the murder is that petitioner suspected her multiple affairs with other persons.

5. As per the status report, the dead body of the victim was found with neck slit and multiple cut injuries on her body near a railway track, Shakur Basti Railway Station. FIR was registered under Section 302 IPC. The CCTV camera installed at the railway station revealed that the deceased and the petitioner were found roaming near the place of occurrence. This led to arrest of the petitioner, who identified the body of the victim and gave disclosure statement that he was in relationship with the victim and suspected that she was having multiple affairs and was ignoring him.

6. The case is based on circumstantial evidence. The weapon of offence is stated to have been recovered at the instance of the present petition and the same has been sent to FSL, Rohini for comparison and expert opinion, but the result is awaited. The trial is still at an initial stage. The possibility that on being granted bail, petitioner may tamper the evidence cannot be ruled out.

7. The allegations are grave and serious in nature, and therefore, the Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. The application is accordingly dismissed.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2025

RM