



\$~4 & 10

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1714/2025**

MANDEEP

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Kartik Kumar, Mr.
Akash, Mr. I.S. Singhal,
Mr. Kanchan & Mr. R.
Priya, Advs.

versus

THE STATE GOVT NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State.
SI Shubham, PS Burari.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3538/2025 & CRL.M.A. 27725/2025,**
CRL.M.A. 27726/2025

RAVINDER

.....Applicant

Through: Ms. Pallavi Garg
DHCLSC & Ms. Sanjana
Sharma Sahu, Advs.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP
for the State.
SI Shubham, PS Burari.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

15.10.2025

1. The present applications are filed seeking regular bail in FIR No. 465/2024 dated 30.06.2024, registered at Police Station Burari for offences under Sections 392/397/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').

2. Briefly stated, the FIR was registered on a complaint given



by one Arun (hereafter '**the victim**'). It is alleged that on 30.06.2024, at around 2:30 PM, when the victim was in his office, two individuals came to the victim's office on a black motorcycle. It is alleged that thereafter one of them took out a pistol, threatened the victim and took his gold chain, gold ring and a silver bracelet. Thereafter, the other individual opened a drawer in the victim's office and took a sum of ₹50,000/- and a black purse.

3. The applicants were arrested in the present case on 02.07.2024. Further, a recovery of a golden chain, golden ring, and a metallic '*kada*' was made from the house of applicant Ravinder.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutors for the State, at the outset, vehemently oppose the grant of any relief to the applicants and submit that the antecedents of the applicants do not entitle them to grant of any relief. They submit that the applicant Mandeep is an accused in two more cases of similar nature registered for the offences under Sections 392/397/411 of the IPC and that the applicant Ravinder is an accused in four more cases of similar nature.

5. The learned counsel for the applicants submit that the liability in other cases has been sought to be fastened on the applicants after they were arrested in the present case. They submit that the applicants have been falsely implicated solely for the reason that they were in custody and their names have been mentioned as accused in the said cases as well.

6. They submit that the victim was examined by the learned Trial Court, wherein he categorically deposed that the robbed



articles, which were allegedly recovered from the applicants, did not belong to him. They submit that the same casts a serious doubt on the veracity of the case of the prosecution.

7. The statement of the victim dated 06.09.2025 has been handed over in the Court. The same is taken on record.

8. It is pertinent to note that the case property was shown to the victim which contained one gold ring, one silver *kada* and a gold chain. It is also relevant to mention that the victim, after seeing the case property, stated that none of the articles belonged to him.

9. It is the case of the prosecution that the applicants entered the office of the victim, pointed a gun at him and compelled him to hand over his gold chain, gold ring and a silver bracelet. It is also the case of the prosecution that the stolen articles were recovered from the applicants.

10. While the intricacies of the evidence cannot be commented upon at this stage as the same is subject matter of trial, however, considering the statement of the victim that the articles allegedly recovered from the applicants do not belong to him, the same, in the opinion of this Court, creates some doubt in the story of the prosecution, the benefit of which cannot be denied to the applicants at this stage.

11. The applicants were arrested way back on 02.07.2024. The applicants have been in custody for a substantial period of time and no further investigation is pending. The object of jail is to secure the appearance of the accused during the trial. The object is neither punitive nor preventive and the deprivation of liberty has been considered as a punishment.



12. Insofar as the antecedents of the applicants is concerned, as noted above, the applicants pursuant to their arrest, were made accused in the other FIRs. Whether the applicants were falsely implicated in the said cases or not ought not to be commented upon at this stage. Having noted so, merely because other cases are pending against the applicants cannot be the sole ground for denying them bail when, as noted above, the applicants have *prima facie* made out a case for grant of bail [Ref: ***Prabhakar Tewari v. State of U.P. : (2020) 11 SCC 648***].

13. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the present applications are allowed and the applicants are directed to be released on furnishing a personal bond for a sum of ₹20,000/- each with one surety of the like amount each, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court, on the following conditions:

- a. The applicants shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;
- b. The applicants shall under no circumstance leave the country without the permission of the learned Trial Court;
- c. The applicants shall appear before the learned Trial Court as and when directed;
- d. The applicants shall provide the addresses where they would be residing after their release and shall not change the addresses without informing



the concerned IO/ SHO;

- e. The applicants shall, upon their release, give their mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep their mobile phones switched on at all times.

14. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry/complaint lodged against the applicants, it would be open to the respondent to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

15. It is clarified that the observations made in the present order are only for the purpose of deciding the present 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.

16. The bail applications are allowed in the aforementioned terms. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

17. A copy of this order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 15, 2025

“SK”