



\$~42

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3300/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25765/2025**

AMAR SINGH @ PALIApplicant
Through: Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Mr.
D.P. Yadav and Ms.
Sandhya, Advs.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State with SI
Narender Kumar, PS
Pahar Ganj.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

% **ORDER**
29.08.2025

1. By the present bail application, the applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No. 247/2025 dated 15.04.2025, registered at Police Station Pahar Ganj, for offences under Sections 110/351(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS').

2. It is the case of the prosecution that on finding out that a quarrel had erupted between his brother Abhishek and accused Ranveer, the complainant reached the spot and left from there with his brother. Allegedly, the accused Ranveer shouted at the complainant and his brother and tried to stop them, whereafter, accused Lalit pointed a pistol at them. The accused persons, including the applicant, gave beatings to the complainant and his brother with lathis and dandas. During the altercation, the complainant also sustained serious injury on his jaw, which also

BAIL APPLN. 3300/2025

Page 1 of 4



led to surgery. During investigation, the footage from a CCTV camera installed near the place of occurrence was examined, which shows the applicant beating the complainant mercilessly.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that as co-accused Neeraj has already been admitted on bail by the learned Trial Court, the applicant is entitled for grant of bail on the ground of parity.

4. *Per contra*, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor ('APP') opposes the said contention and submits that the role attributed to the applicant is graver than that of co-accused Neeraj as the said co-accused had attacked the brother of the complainant who sustained minor injuries. He further submits that the applicant is involved in multiple other cases and he has been declared as a "bad character" of the area.

5. I have heard the counsel and perused the record.

6. In the present case, the incident is stated to be caught on CCTV camera and the same *prima facie* suggests that the applicant was involved in the commission of the alleged offence.

7. The present application is pressed essentially on the ground of parity with co-accused Neeraj, who was admitted on bail by order dated 10.06.2025 by the learned Trial Court. In the said order, it was observed that the MLC of the complainant suggested that he was discharged on the same day and the custody of co-accused Neeraj was no longer required.

8. As pointed out by the learned APP, while the co-accused Neeraj attacked the brother of the complainant, the applicant allegedly attacked the complainant, who suffered serious injuries in the entire jaw. *Prima facie*, the role ascribed to the applicant is



graver and he can claim no parity with co-accused Neeraj.

9. Insofar as the observation made by the learned Trial Court in relation to the complainant being discharged from Hospital on the same day is concerned, it is pertinent to note that the injuries suffered by the brother of the complainant are grievous in nature and the same also led to the victim being required to undergo surgeries.

10. Even otherwise, this Court cannot ignore the prior antecedents of the applicant. It is pointed out that the applicant has been involved in multiple cases, including one case for the offence under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. The applicant is also stated to be declared as a “bad character” of the area.

11. In such circumstances, at this stage, the likelihood of the applicant threatening or influencing the witnesses and the victims cannot be ruled out.

12. While deciding the question of bail, the Court is required to carefully balance the individual’s right to liberty with public interest at large. While the presumption of innocence and the right to liberty are fundamental principles of law, they must be considered in conjunction with the gravity of the offence and its impact on society.

13. In view of the aforesaid discussion, considering the antecedents of the applicant and the nature of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant at this juncture.

14. In view of the above, the present bail application is dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

15. It is made clear that the observations made in the present



case are only for the purpose of considering the bail applications and should not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 29, 2025

'KDK'