



\$~74

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4877/2025**

HANSRAJ @ PIRU @ RAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vimal Goyal, Mr. Pranav Goyal,
Mr. Amogh Nath Pal, Ms. Mreeganka
Goyal and Mr. Vishant Singh,
Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State
with SI Himanshu

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **16.12.2025**

CRL.M.A. 37579/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 4877/2025

3. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 608/2025, registered at Police Station Alipur, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Sections 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959.
4. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. Briefly stated, the FIR in this case was registered pursuant to receipt



of PCR call on 16.11.2025. It is stated that *vide* DD No. 50A, an incident of firing was reported at P.S. Alipur, wherein the caller had reported that his neighbour had quarrelled with him and fired in the air while fleeing on a motorcycle. During the enquiry, the complainant alleged that on 16.11.2025 at about 1:05 PM, his sons were working in the field sowing wheat when a tubewell pipe had burst, flooding the field and threatening damage to the crop. The tubewell was managed by his nephew, the present applicant, who, despite repeated requests over the past three years, had failed to repair the same. While proceeding towards the field, the complainant had met the applicant, who had abused him, threatened to kill him, and had left the spot. Thereafter, the applicant had returned to the field, again threatened the complainant, and had fired a gunshot with intent to kill him, but the complainant had narrowly escaped. When the complainant's son Rajesh had attempted to record the incident, the accused had fled the spot. It was further disclosed that a property dispute was pending between the parties, with a partition suit pending before the High Court, and that the accused had earlier also extended threats, in respect of which a complaint was lodged on 10.10.2025. The crime scene was inspected by the crime team; however, no exhibits were recovered from the spot. During enquiry, it was revealed that the applicant/accused Hansraj @ Piru was absconding from his residence. Accordingly, on the statement of the complainant, the present FIR was registered under the relevant sections.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, and there are material contradictions in the statement of the complainant and a long-standing property dispute exists between the parties. It is further argued



that the applicant has not been involved in any criminal activity since the year 2016. It is also argued that upon examination of the spot of the incident, no incriminating material was recovered by police.

7. The learned APP for the State does not dispute that no injury was caused to any person in the present case. It is also not in dispute that subsequent to the registration of the present FIR, no other case has been registered against the present applicant. However, it is stated that the learned Trial Court has issued non-bailable warrants against the applicant on the ground that he failed to join the investigation. It is contended that the complainant has narrated the entire incident and has alleged that the applicant acted with the intention to kill the complainant, as there was a prior land dispute between the parties. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be not granted anticipatory bail.

8. This Court has **heard** the arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant/accused and the learned APP for the state and has perused the case file.

9. Having gone through the material available on record, this Court notes that upon inspection of the crime scene by the crime team, no empty bullet cartridge was recovered. It is further an admitted fact that no injury has been caused to the complainant or any other person in the present case.

10. This Court also notes that the applicant/accused has been involved in eight criminal cases in the past, however, no case has been registered against him after the year 2016, except the present one. There is also a civil dispute related to land pending before the accused and the complainant.

11. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is ordered that in the event of arrest, the applicant shall be released on



anticipatory bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/I.O. concerned on the following terms and conditions:

- i) The applicant shall join the investigation today at 4:00 PM, and thereafter, as and when called by the I.O.
 - ii) The applicant shall remain available on the mobile numbers shared by him with the Police.
 - iii) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned court.
 - iv) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make an attempt to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
 - iv) In case of a change of residential address/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned court as well I.O./SHO.
12. The bail application is allowed in the above terms.
13. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

DECEMBER 16, 2025/ns

TD