



\$~91

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 605/2026**

STATE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC (Crl.)
with Mr. Arjit Sharma and Ms.
Sakshi Jha, Advocates.

versus

MD. UBEDULLAH

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shakir Shabir, Mr. Videh
Vaish, Mr. A.F. Faizi, Mr. M.K.
Malik, Mr. Amit Singh, Mr. Tabish
Kamal, Mr. Sazid S.R. Shah,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **23.01.2026**

CRL.M.A. 2616/2026 (for urgent directions)

1. This application has been filed by the respondent – accused in view of some difficulty in implementation of the order dated 22.01.2026, by which his bail application [BAIL APPLN. 96/2026] was remanded for fresh consideration to the learned Sessions Court. The prayer in the application is as follows:

“a. Clarify and/or modify the directions contained in the order dated 22.01.2026 to the effect that Bail Application No. 96/2026 shall be taken up forthwith by the concerned learned Sessions Court and in the event of non-availability of the roster court/judge, the same shall be taken up by the Link/Duty Additional Sessions Judge, Central District, as per roster, and be heard and decided expeditiously (preferably today itself / within 24 hours);

b. Direct the Registry/Court Master to forthwith transmit/communicate



the order dated 22.01.2026 (and/or the order passed on this application) by official electronic mode/e-mail and through Sessions Branch to: the Court of learned ASJ (FTC)-01, Central (Sh. J.P. Nahar), and the Link/Duty ASJ concerned, and the office of the District & Sessions Judge (Central), so that the remanded bail application is listed and taken up without delay;

c. Pending hearing and disposal of Bail Application No. 96/2026 on remand, grant interim protection to the Respondent/Applicant by directing his release on interim bail on such terms as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit (including on the same terms as earlier imposed), or pass such protective direction as this Hon'ble Court deems fit, so that the Respondent/Applicant's liberty is not defeated due to administrative/communication impediments;

d. Pass such other and further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. Although it was directed that the application be heard today at 10:00 AM, I am informed that the learned Roster Judge was not available, and the learned Link Judge declined to hear the application.

3. Mr. Shakir Shabir, learned counsel for the respondent, states that the learned Link Judge, instead of hearing the case himself, requested the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge ["PD&SJ"] to assign it to the same Judge who had passed the impugned order dated 20.01.2026. However, I am informed that the learned PD&SJ was not available at the time. According to Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, learned Additional Standing Counsel (Criminal) for the State, the case has been since marked to the learned Additional Sessions Judge who had passed the impugned order dated 20.01.2026.

4. In this view of the matter, it is directed that the case be taken up by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, as assigned by the PD&SJ, tomorrow i.e., 24.01.2026 at 10:00 AM. If the learned Judge is not available for any reason, the matter may be mentioned before the learned



PD&SJ, who is requested to either take the matter up herself, or assign it to any other learned Additional Sessions Judge for consideration, in compliance with the order dated 22.01.2026.

5. In the event bail is granted pursuant to these directions, the matter be listed before the concerned Magistrate at 3:00 PM tomorrow for verification of the bail bond.

6. The Registry is directed to communicate the order dated 22.01.2026, and this order, to the Office of the learned PD&SJ, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, New Delhi, forthwith.

7. The parties may also furnish this order before the learned Sessions Court.

8. At this stage, I have also noticed that there is a typographical error in the order dated 22.01.2026, to the extent that paragraph 13 which reads as “*Needless to say, the petitioner’s remedies before this Court remain reserved.*”, should read as follows:

“13. Needless to say, the parties’ remedies before this Court remain reserved.”

The order dated 22.01.2026 be read accordingly

9. The application stands disposed of.

10. A copy of the order be given *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 23, 2026

SS/KA/