



\$~80

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 1749/2025**
ANIKETPetitioner

Through: Mr. Hirein Sharma, Mr. Viman Tyagi,
Mr. Balaji Pathak and Mr. Tripurari
Jha, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

% **ORDER**
06.05.2025

1. Through the present petition, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹, the Petitioner seeks grant of interim bail for a period of 15 days to attend the annual *barsi* of his deceased mother. It is noted that before approaching this Court, the Petitioner also filed a similar application seeking interim bail before the Trial Court which was allowed yesterday, i.e., 5th May, 2025, in the following terms:

“Considering all the facts and circumstances and without going into the merits of the case and purely on humanitarian ground, the custody parole of the applicant/accused is allowed from 02.00 PM to 04.00 PM (excluding the time of travelling) for 07.05.2025. The Jail Superintendent concerned is directed accordingly to send the applicant/accused under proper guard to join the annual barsi of his deceased mother at his residence i.e. S-713, Mangol Puri, Delhi.

*With these observations, the application stands disposed off.
Nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount an expression*

¹ “BNSS”



on the merits of the present case. Copy of order be given Dasti. A copy of order be sent to the Jail Superintendent concerned.”

2. Counsel for the Petitioner urges that instead of custody parole, the Petitioner should have been granted the benefit of interim bail on humanitarian grounds, as he has to attend to the annual *barsi* of his deceased mother.
3. The Court has considered the submissions of the Petitioner but remains unsatisfied. In the opinion of the Court, the request of the Petitioner for grant of interim bail has already been allowed, albeit with the condition that police officers would accompany him under proper guard to ensure that he does not abscond.
4. In light of the above, the Court finds no ground to interfere in the impugned order. The Petitioner shall be at liberty to re-apply to the Trial Court for seeking interim bail, in accordance with law.
5. Dismissed, along with pending applications.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 6, 2025

as