



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 2608/2025**
RAMAVTAR JANGIRPetitioner

Through: Mr. Akhilesh Pandey, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC (Crl.) with Mr. Sangeet Sibou, Mr. Priyansh Raj Singh Senger and Mr. Aniket Kr. Singh, Advocates for State.
Inspector Kishore Kumar, P.S. Vasant Kunj, North.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
19.11.2025

%

1. The Petitioner is an under trial in FIR No. 106/2025 dated 5th March, 2025, registered under Sections 103(1) and 238(a) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023¹ at P.S. Vasant Kunj North, Delhi.
2. The Petitioner's bail application was rejected by the Sessions Court. The Petitioner has not challenged the said order. Instead, he has filed the present writ petition seeking a declaration that his arrest be declared illegal. The sole foundation of this plea is that the grounds of arrest were not supplied to him. Notably, this very contention was specifically considered and rejected by the Sessions Court while dismissing the Petitioner's bail

¹ "BNS"



application on 11th July, 2025.

3. As per the Status Report, the Petitioner was supplied with the grounds of arrest on 6th March, 2025, i.e., the date of his arrest. A copy of the same has been supplied and is taken on record. The grounds of arrest bear the signatures of the Petitioner. However, when confronted with the above document, counsel for the Petitioner contends that the Petitioner's signatures are forged and that the document does not form part of the chargesheet, as it was allegedly never supplied to the Petitioner.

4. The Court has not commented on the said document as there is no basis for the Court to form any opinion that signatures of the Petitioner were forged. Moreover, the remand order dated 6th March, 2025, records as follows:

“Arrest memo perused as per which the accused was arrested on 06.03.2025 at 8:20 AM. Information of his arrest was given to his father. Ground of arrest have been explained to the accused.

MLC of the accused seen as per which he is 27 years old. No fresh external injury reported. No claim of juvenility has been made by the accused.

It is submitted by the IO that the accused has been arrested on the basis of information given by the complainant. The accused along with the deceased / victim had taken a room on rent in the month of November, 2024. The complainant was caretaker of the said property. Thereafter, the said room was locked for few months. The mobile phones of the accused and victim were also switched off. When the caretaker along with other persons broke the door of the room which was taken on rent by the accused and victim, then the dead body of the victim in a highly decomposed condition was found. As per the IO, the accused has disclosed his involvement in the present case.

An application has been filed by the IO seeking four days police remand of the accused on the ground that the same is required in order to recover the key of the lock of the room, the clothes which he was wearing while committing the offence, the sim card which he was using to talk with the victim and for conducting sustained investigation.

I have gone through the case record including the case diary.

I am satisfied with the ground of arrest given by the accused. Same has been explained to the accused.



Considering the fact that allegations against the accused are/related to the offence of murder and the investigation is at the initial stage, the application filed by the IO is allowed in view of the reasons given by the IO in his application. PC of the accused is granted for 3 days. His custody is handed over to the IO Inspector Kishore. He be medically examined as per rules and be produced before the Court on 09.03.2025.”

5. The aforementioned order further indicates that the accused was accompanied by a remand advocate, the information regarding the arrest was conveyed to the Petitioner's father, and the grounds of arrest were duly explained to the Petitioner. In view of these contemporaneous judicial records, the Court finds no basis to issue the declaration sought by the Petitioner.
6. This Court is satisfied that the grounds of arrest were duly supplied to the Petitioner. No merit is found in the present petition.
7. Dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2025

as