



\$~12

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 117/2026**

VIJAY @ MOOLCHAND @ SONU @ MOOLIPetitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Yadav, Ms. Nirmala Singh, Ms. Mamta Chouhan, Mr. Rajesh Shagal, Mr. Sumit Chauhan
Advocates

versus

THE STATE THROUGH S.H.O P.S ANAND PARBAT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State with
Insp. Aadesh Kumar

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

11.03.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 0225/2022, registered at Police Station Anand Parbat, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 302/308/342/143/147/148/149/364/365/201/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC').

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 14.04.2022, pursuant to DD No. 78A, information was received from Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel Hospital regarding an unknown male aged about 18–20 years who had been brought dead. The police officials had reached the hospital where the deceased was identified as Ritik, aged about 22 years, resident of Baljit Nagar, Anand Parbat. It was revealed that the incident had taken place



at Azad Mohalla, Anand Parbat. The Crime Team and FSL Team inspected the spot and six exhibits, including two metallic rods/pipes (alleged weapons of offence), were lifted and seized. The deceased was thereafter declared brought dead at RML Hospital *vide* MLC No. 74694/22. Meanwhile, *vide* DD No. 92A, it was learnt that another person namely Manoj @ Pappu, aged about 16 years, had also sustained injuries in the same incident and had been admitted to RML Hospital. In his statement, he stated that about 4–5 days prior to the incident, an altercation had taken place between him and accused Vicky @ Pange. On 14.04.2022 at about 01:30 PM, when he along with Ritik was passing near Azad Mohalla, accused Vicky @ Pange along with his associates namely Shivkant @ Avinash, Sonu @ Mooli (*present applicant*), Arjun (CCL) and others allegedly stopped them, forcibly took them to the office of Suraj @ Rikki, wrongfully confined them and assaulted them with iron rods, during which Ritik became unconscious. During investigation, several accused persons were apprehended who allegedly disclosed that the assault had been committed due to the earlier altercation with the complainant. It is alleged that both victims were taken to the office of Suraj @ Rikki where they were repeatedly assaulted with iron rods. Thereafter, the injured Ritik was taken to Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel Hospital where he was declared dead. The Post-Mortem Report opined that the cause of death was shock and haemorrhage due to multiple blunt force injuries sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature. It is further stated that CCTV footage collected from nearby locations allegedly shows the accused persons taking the complainant and the deceased to the place of incident and later taking the deceased to the hospital. The CDR and location details of some of the accused persons allegedly place them at the spot at the



relevant time. After completion of investigation, a charge-sheet was filed against the accused persons under Sections 302/308/342/364/365/143/147/148/149/201/34 of the IPC and the matter is presently pending trial.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the present accused/applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case, and he has been in judicial custody since 12.05.2022. It is contended that no *prima facie* case is made out against the applicant, as there is no evidence on record to suggest that the applicant has committed the alleged offence. It is argued the complainant has not supported the prosecution case before the learned Trial Court in the cross-examination. It is also stated that the applicant has no criminal antecedents. Therefore, it is prayed that the present accused be granted regular bail.

4. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the present bail application and argues that allegations against the applicant are serious in nature, and if released, the applicant herein may extend threats to the prosecution witnesses. Thus, it is prayed that the bail application be rejected.

5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has perused the material available on record.

6. In the present case, this Court notes that the complainant has not supported the prosecution case during his cross-examination before the learned Trial Court. It is also a matter of record that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 12.05.2022, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. In view of these circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that the applicant has made out a case for grant of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the applicant is admitted to regular bail on furnishing a



personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000 with one surety of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned, and subject to the following terms and conditions:

- i) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court and if he has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the concerned trial court.
- ii) The applicant shall share his contact details (mobile numbers and residential address) with the IO/SHO and the Trial Court; and in case of any change in the said details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court and the concerned IO/SHO.
- iii) The applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on every date of hearing unless exempted;
- iv) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity;
- v) 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.

8. Accordingly, the present bail application stands allowed and is disposed of.

9. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

10. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MARCH 11, 2026/dT.D.