



\$~4

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2603/2025**

RAHUL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ranvir Singh, Adv.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for
State with SI Gaurav PS Kalyanpuri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

20.11.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking regular bail in connection with FIR No. 792/2023 under Sections 307/341/34/174-A IPC, registered at PS Kalyanpuri, Delhi.
2. The case of the prosecution as borne out from the FIR is that complainant Aman stated that there is enmity between his brother-in-law Arjun and Manoj Aligarhiya. Due to this enmity on 04.09.2023 at around 12:30 AM, Manoj Aligarhiya along with his brothers-in-law reached the house of complainant's mother-in-law namely, Sikandar Kaur to take revenge from Arjun, where Arjun was not present. In the meanwhile Sikander Kaur called the complainant and told that Manoj Aligarhiya and his brothers-in-law had come to beat Arjun. On hearing this the complainant Aman and Rohit rushed to Arjun's house on a motorcycle and when they both reached at the square of 16 block Kalyanpuri at around 12:30 AM, they



were stopped by Manoj Aligarhiya and his brothers-in-law Sonu, Rahul and Arun. Rohit was able to free himself and run away but the complainant could not, then Manoj Aligarhiya stabbed the complainant Aman three or four times with a knife while other Accused persons caught hold of him.

3. Mr. Ranvir Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that the role attributed to the petitioner is similar to that of Arun inasmuch as, the allegation against both Rahul and Arun is that they both had caught hold of the complainant while injury was inflicted by other co-accused Manoj Aligarhiya.

4. He contends that co-accused Arun has already been granted regular bail by this Court *vide* order dated 04.04.2025 passed in BAIL APPLN. 53/2025, which fact is not in dispute.

5. Status report has been handed over across the bar, the same is taken on record.

6. On a pointed query posed by the Court as to whether the role of the petitioner and that of Arun is similar, Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, the learned APP appearing on behalf of State, on instructions from the IO, fairly states that the role assigned to the present petitioner is similar to that of Arun.

7. This Court also finds that the petitioner is in custody since 12.08.2024 and the investigation has been concluded, therefore, custody of petitioner is not required for any further investigation.

8. It is not the case of the prosecution in the status report that the petitioner has any previous involvements.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is also entitled to regular bail.

10. Accordingly, the petitioner is admitted on regular bail subject to his



furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/JMFC/Duty JM, further subject to the following conditions:

- a. Petitioner shall appear before the Court as and when the matter is taken up for hearing.
 - b. Petitioner shall provide mobile number to the IO concerned which shall be kept in working condition at all times and he shall not change the mobile number without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer concerned.
 - c. Petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or communicate with or come in contact with witnesses.
11. It is clarified that the observations made herein above are only for the limited purpose of deciding the present bail application, and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
 12. The application is disposed of.
 13. Copy of the order be forwarded to the concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary compliance.
 14. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2025

N.S. ASWAL