



\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 126/2026**

ABDUL ADNAN @ HANNAN @A.K

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Advocate

versus

STATE (THROUGH SHO PS DAYAL PUR)

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

16.03.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 350/2025, registered at Police Station Dayal Pur, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 109(1)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter '*BNS*').

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 27.07.2025, a PCR call *vide* DD No. 127A regarding a stabbing incident was received. Upon receipt of the call, the I.O. had reached the spot where the complainant/injured was not found present. On enquiry, it was revealed that the injured had been shifted to JPC Hospital and thereafter referred to GTB Hospital. The injured/complainant, namely Sameer, was found admitted and under treatment at GTB Hospital. During the course of the investigation, the statement of eyewitness/complainant Farhan was recorded, who stated that



on 27.07.2025 at about 10:30 PM, he was standing in front of Rani Marriage Home when his friend Sameer had arrived there on a motorcycle along with Bhura and Adil and had inquired about the whereabouts of Adnan @ AK (the present applicant/accused). Thereafter, after making a phone call and receiving information that the applicant/accused was present nearby, Sameer, along with the others, had proceeded towards Chandu Nagar. Upon reaching there, they had found that the applicant/accused, along with co-accused persons, namely Salman, Noorain, Aman and 2–3 unknown persons, were already present at the spot. When Sameer and Adil had approached them, the said persons had suddenly attacked Sameer with knives. It is further stated that when the eyewitness and others had attempted to intervene, the accused persons had fled from the spot upon seeing public persons gathering at the place of occurrence.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the alleged enmity existed only between the co-accused Mohd. Noorain and the injured person, and merely because the present applicant is acquainted with the said co-accused, he has been falsely implicated in the present case without any independent role attributed to him. Further, it is argued that the co-accused Chiragraj @ Raja has already been granted regular bail and, therefore, the applicant is also entitled to bail on the ground of parity. It is also argued that the complainant did not name the applicant in the FIR. It is further submitted that the alleged involvement of the applicant is sought to be established only on the basis of disclosure statements of the co-accused persons. It is also stated that the applicant has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case. Accordingly, it is prayed that the applicant be enlarged on regular bail.



4. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the State opposes the bail application and submits that the allegations against the applicant are grave and serious in nature. It is argued that the applicant had stabbed the injured person with a knife, as a result of which the victim had sustained grievous injuries, and the weapon of offence has been recovered at the instance of the applicant herein. It is further argued that the involvement of the applicant is clearly reflected in the CCTV footage, wherein he is allegedly seen stabbing the injured person. The learned APP, on instructions from the I.O., further submits that charges have not yet been framed in the present case; however, it has been inadvertently mentioned in the Status Report that the charges have already been framed. It is further argued that there are three eyewitnesses to the incident, namely Farhan (the complainant), Mohd. Sameer, and Adil Saifi, whose testimonies are yet to be recorded before the learned Trial Court. On these grounds, it is prayed that the applicant be not enlarged on regular bail.

5. One of the victims and injured is present in person before this Court, who has also opposed the bail application of the applicant.

6. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant/accused and the learned APP for the State, and has perused the material on record.

7. In a nutshell, the allegations against the applicant/accused are that he was seen stabbing the injured, Sameer, with a knife, thereby causing injuries to him. This Court notes that the CCTV footage collected during the course of investigation also *prima facie* corroborates the presence of the applicant/accused at the spot and also shows him assaulting the injured person with a knife.



8. This Court also notes that the injured in this case was taken to the hospital after the alleged incident, and the medical examination, *vide* MLC No. B-M18001402505052/25, revealed that he had sustained nine wounds. It is pertinent to note that the doctors had opined that the injuries were caused by a sharp weapon and were *grievous* in nature.

9. It is also material to note that during the course of investigation, the alleged weapon of offence used in the commission of the crime, i.e, four knives were recovered from a drain at the instance of the present accused/applicant after he pointed out the said location to the I.O.

10. In aforesaid background facts and circumstances, this Court notes that charges in the present case are yet to be framed, and the testimonies of the material witnesses including the eyewitnesses are yet to be recorded. Considering that the applicant and the said witnesses reside in the same vicinity, the possibility of him influencing or intimidating the witnesses cannot be ruled out at this stage.

11. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of offence, alleged role of the applicant and material collected against him during investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant/accused.

12. The bail application is accordingly dismissed.

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

14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MARCH 16, 2026/ns

rb