



\$~7

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3328/2025**

GURNAAM SINGH @ RANGEELA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhinav Dubey and Mr. P.
Pratap, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

28.10.2025

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in FIR bearing no.476/2010, registered at Police Station Kalkaji, Delhi for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 363/365 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC').
2. Briefly stated, facts of the present case are that on 27.08.2010, Smt. Indu Devi's son, Rahul @ Chandan, a Class XII student of Pratibha Vidyalaya, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi, went to school but did not return home. On the same day, the complainant's daughter had received a call from the bus conductor Md. Dilshad, who informed her that Rahul's school bag and belongings had been recovered. When asked where the belongings were found, Dilshad abruptly disconnected the call and switched off his mobile phone. Subsequently, at about 9:00 PM on the same day, the



complainant received information that a dead body of a boy had been found on the railway track near Okhla Railway Station. The dead body was identified as that of son of the complainant, Rahul @ Chandan. The complainant alleged that her son was murdered and his body was thrown on the railway track to make it appear as a train accident. It was further alleged that the local police avoided registering the FIR and had attempted to shield the culprits. Pursuant to the directions of the learned ACMM, Saket Courts, New Delhi.

3. During the course of investigation, witnesses and classmates of the deceased were examined, and it was revealed that a quarrel had taken place between the deceased and the bus conductor a day prior to the incident. The investigation was subsequently transferred to DIU/SED and later to Inspector Vijay Kumar, who added Section 302 of IPC. As per the post-mortem report, the cause of death was shock and hemorrhage resulting from craniocerebral injuries and injury to abdominal viscera caused by blunt force impact. A medical board which was formed to give opinion on indentifying the cause of the death of deceased, opined that the injuries sustained were consistent with the impact of a moving train. Thereafter, the investigation was thereafter transferred to the Crime Branch and entrusted to Inspector In-charge, who filed a cancellation report before the Ld. MM, Saket Court. Upon a protest petition by the complainant, further investigation was ordered and taken up by ACP Anjani Kumar, DIU/SED. Polygraph tests of the driver Bharat Lal and cleaner Gurnam Singh @ Rangeela revealed nothing adverse. However, subsequent investigation by ACP B.P. Yadav disclosed that a quarrel had occurred between Rahul and conductor Dilshad, assisted by cleaner Gurnam Singh. It was found that Dilshad had restrained



and assaulted Rahul in the bus on the day of the incident, while Bharat Lal, the driver, was not involved. Consequently, a charge sheet was filed against Md. Dilshad (deceased) under Section 323 IPC and against Gurnam Singh @ Rangeela under Sections 323/341/342/34 IPC, whereas Bharat Lal's name was placed in Column No. 12 for want of evidence.

4. The chargesheet in the present case was filed under Sections 323/341/342/34 of IPC. It is stated that the present petitioner was the helper of the driver of a bus plying from Old Delhi Railway Station to DDA Flats, Kalkaji, Delhi and on 26.08.2010, the deceased who was a school boy aged about 17 years had altercation with the conductor of the bus.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the present accused/applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has been in judicial custody for two and a half years. It is also submitted that the prosecution evidence has just begun and the prosecution evidence has been partly examined. It is further argued that the co-accused in the present case has also been granted bail *vide* order dated 11.12.2024, passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Therefore, it is prayed that accused/applicant be granted regular bail.

6. This Court takes note of the fact that the IO concerned had earlier filed the closure report and while deciding the fresh petition filed by the mother of the deceased, the learned Trial Court had rejected the closure report filed by the IO *vide* order dated 05.03.2015 and was pleased to take cognizance of the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that to show his *bona-fides*, the petitioner had voluntarily offered himself up for a lie-detector test,



which was conducted on 19.05.2014; and report dated 30.05.2014 of the polygraph test, the Senior Scientific Officer, FSL, Rohini, Delhi has opined that upon an analysis and evaluations of the polygraphs, *no deceptive responses are revealed* to the questions put to the petitioner and that the petitioner has been found to be '*trustful*'.

8. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, does not dispute the same and further states that the co-accused/ Bharat Lal has already been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 11.12.2024. This Court has heard arguments addressed by the learned counsel for both the parties and has perused the material on record.

9. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and for the reasons recorded hereinabove and the fact that the present accused/applicant has been in judicial custody for two and a half years and that the FIR in the present case pertains to the year 2010 wherein a closure report had earlier been filed and this Court also takes into account that 55 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution and the trial will take considerable time to conclude, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms and conditions:

- i) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court and if the applicant has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the concerned trial court.
- ii) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the



applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court and IO/SHO concerned.

- iii) The applicant shall appear in Court on every date of hearing unless exempted;
- iv) The applicant shall not communicate with, or come into contact with the complainant or any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.

10. Accordingly, the present bail application stands disposed of.

11. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 28, 2025/vc