



\$~30

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2332/2025**

RAMANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sachin Shukla, Advocate with
Mr. Aakash Passi, Mr. Nikhil
Gupta, Mr. Ankit Duhan, Mr. Hamid
Hussain and Mr. Jasraj Singh,
Advocates

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SHO PS ANAND PARBAT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **03.07.2025**

CRL.M.A. 18590/2025 (exemption)

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

BAIL APPLN. 2332/2025

3. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case out of FIR bearing no. 519/2024, registered at Police Station Anand Parbat, Delhi or the offences punishable under Sections 118(1) and 118(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').
4. Briefly stated, the present FIR in this case came to be registered on the complaint of complainant alleging therein that on 31.10.2024, when he was celebrating Diwali with his friends at about 03:30 AM, some persons



who had consumed alcohol were arguing with each other. When he had raised an objection, one of those boys i.e. Raman had started arguing with him and had also beaten him. When he had started going towards his house, someone had attacked him with a sharp object. After reaching home, his family members had taken him to Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital where he had given his statement to the police. The matter was investigated. The complainant had sustained multiple injuries i.e. “0.5*.5*.5 cm over (L) eye, multiple stab wounds (+) over anille (L) upper am (lateral as pect) (L) shoulder stab wound of 1*1*0.5 cm over medial side of (2) upper arm of size 3*1*1 cm stab wound of 0.5*0.5*0.5 cm over (L) Upper Back and 2*1*1 cm over Rt. Shoulder” and the accused persons were arrested.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the applicant herein has been falsely implicated in the present case, and he has pointed out the discrepancies in the time of alleged incident and the time when MLC of the complainant was conducted. It is stated that the complainant and the applicant are known to each other and accused has no previous involvement, and further that the applicant is a young boy of 22 years of age. It is specifically argued that the complainant is a person of quarrelsome nature who has been involved in many other cases of the similar nature. It is argued that the applicant has joined investigation and is ready to cooperate with the investigation as and when required. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that the custodial interrogation of the present accused is required for recovery of the weapon of offence. It is stated that the three anticipatory bail applications of the applicant have been rejected by the learned Sessions Court and one



anticipatory bail has been rejected by this Court. It is argued that the injury has been caused on the vital part of the body of the complainant and therefore, it is prayed that the present application for grant of anticipatory bail be dismissed.

7. This Court has heard arguments addressed on behalf of both the sides and has perused the material available on record.

8. This Court notes that NBWs have been issued against the present accused/applicant and that the anticipatory bail applications of the applicant were rejected on 09.01.2025, 28.01.2025 and 28.05.2025 by the learned Sessions Court and on 18.02.2025 by this Court.

9. This Court also notes that there are specific allegations in the FIR against the present accused/applicant that he had attacked the complainant with a sharp object. The anticipatory bail application of the accused was rejected *vide* a detailed order by this Court. This Court therefore finds no merit in the present bail application, and considering the gravity of the alleged offence and the fact that the present accused/applicant has not joined investigation even after rejection of four anticipatory bail applications, three by the learned Sessions Court and one by this Court, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the present accused/applicant.

10. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.

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

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JULY 03, 2025/vc

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