



\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 213/2026**

NAVEEN @GHODA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Pipaniya, Mr. Paras
Punyani, Mr. Deepak Mathur, Mr.
Harsh Tomar, Ms. Nikita Garg,
Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

24.03.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of interim bail for a period of two weeks in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 493/2021, registered at Police Station Mundka, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 302/201/365/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC') and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.
2. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
3. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case, as per the prosecution, are that on 01.06.2021, information was received *vide* DD 70A from the complainant, Poonam, regarding the missing of her son, Akshay. It is alleged that on the intervening night preceding the said date, at about 11:00 PM, the victim was forcibly taken away by two neighbours in an i20 car. Pursuant to the said information, an FIR was registered and investigation



was duly initiated.

4. During the course of investigation, the i20 car in question was recovered from a vacant plot and was found to contain blood stains. The said vehicle was ascertained to be registered in the name of the present accused/applicant, Naveen @ Ghoda. Pursuant to the information received, the present applicant along with co-accused Charanjeet @ Chintu was apprehended. During interrogation, they made disclosure statements to the effect that the applicant harboured a grudge against the deceased, Akshay, on account of the latter's failure to assist him in a prior altercation involving one Surender @ Pappu and his associates. It was further disclosed that, in furtherance of a premeditated conspiracy with other co-accused persons, the applicant lured the deceased into his i20 car, offered him a drink, and thereafter shot him dead on the intervening night of 31.05.2021 and 01.06.2021. The dead body was subsequently disposed of in a drain near village Jharoda Kalan. At the instance of the applicant, the weapon of offence, i.e., a pistol along with two live cartridges, was recovered. The applicant and co-accused also pointed out the place of occurrence and facilitated the recovery of the dead body, thereby lending further credence to the prosecution case.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been in judicial custody since 02.06.2021. It is further contended that the FSL report does not support the prosecution case insofar as the present applicant is concerned, and that the complainant failed to identify the applicant during her examination before the learned Trial Court. Learned counsel further argues that the CCTV footage does not depict the applicant abducting the



deceased, and that the blood stains found on the clothes of the deceased do not match with that of the present applicant. It is additionally argued that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. It is also pointed out that a co-accused in the present case has already been granted bail and that the complainant has not supported the prosecution case. On these grounds, it is prayed that the applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State strongly opposed the present bail application, and argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is also stated that the recovery of the weapon of offence was affected at the instance of the present applicant/ accused, for which ballistic report has been received and supports the case of the prosecution. It is thus prayed that the present bail application be dismissed.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has perused the case file.

8. After hearing the arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State, this Court finds that the CCTV footage, which was shown to the complainant at the time of recording her testimony, did not lead to identification of the present applicant, as the complainant, failed to identify the applicant.

9. This Court further notes that the FSL report does not support the prosecution case insofar as the blood samples allegedly recovered from the clothes of the applicant do not match with the blood group of the deceased.

10. Additionally, the applicant has remained in judicial custody since 01.06.2021, i.e., for a period of approximately four years and eight months, and the trial is still likely to take considerable time to conclude.

11. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case



and the reasons mentioned above, including the period of custody already undergone by the applicant, the fact that the applicant has been acquitted of the cases previously registered against him and also that the co-accused has already been granted bail, and that the trial is likely to 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 he has 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.

12. The bail applications are accordingly disposed of.

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

MARCH 24, 2026/vc
GJ