



\$~9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 529/2026**
KARAN NAGARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Naagar with Mr. Akhil
Gusain, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondent

Through: Mr. Ashneet Singh, APP with SI
Naveen.
Complainant in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

%

11.05.2026

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 448/2025, registered at Police Station Pul Prahlad Pur, under Section 110 of BNS, 2023 (corresponding Section 308 IPC).
2. When the matter was taken up by this Court on 09.02.2026, keeping in mind young age of the applicant and previous clean antecedents, he was directed to join the investigation and prosecution was directed to submit a comprehensive report about his joining the investigation. Such order reads as under:-

"1. Applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 448/2025 under Sections 110 BNS 2023 (corresponding Section 308 IPC) registered at P.S. Pul Prahalad Pur, Delhi.

2. The allegation appearing in the FIR would indicate it to be a case of road-rage.

3. The applicant was driving a Scorpio at a fast speed, and while driving the same he crossed a pedestrian i.e. Mr. Mohit Kataria (complainant), an officer with Railways, who, narrowly, escaped collision. The Scorpio driver stopped at some distance and later, entered into a scuffle with the complainant and hit him with a baseball bat.

4. Though, the learned counsel for applicant does admit that the applicant was driving the vehicle in question and there was an altercation also, but denies about the further averments, appearing in the abovesaid FIR.

BAIL APPLN. 529/2026

1



5. *The prime-most contention coming from the side of the applicant is that he is young person, who had joined college in the year 2022, and has no previous involvement.*
6. *An affidavit has also been filed by him.*
7. *Learned counsel for complainant appears on advance notice and opposes the bail application. He has also shown photographs of the relevant time when the complainant was admitted in the hospital. He submits that the injuries were quite serious in nature and it was complainant's sheer good luck that the injuries did not prove fatal.*
8. *It is also submitted that after causing the abovesaid incident, the applicant, rather, fled from the scene and injured was, rather, rushed to the hospital by a lady passerby.*
9. *IO is also present and when asked, he also stated that to the best of the information available to him, the applicant is not involved in any other case.*
10. *Learned counsel for applicant submits that the applicant shall abide by any condition to be imposed upon him and would join the investigation as and when so directed by the concerned SHO/IO.*
11. *Let the applicant join the investigation.*
12. *Let the status of his such joining the investigation be apprised by filing a report by next date of hearing with advance copy to the opposite side.*
13. *List on 17.02.2026."*

3. As per status report, the applicant has, though, joined the investigation but is coming up with contradictory versions. It is also submitted by learned APP that, keeping in mind the nature of the allegations and grievous injuries sustained by the complainant, it has, now, been found to be an offence punishable under Section 109 BNS (corresponding Section 307 IPC) and, therefore, Section 110 BNS is now replaced with Section 109 BNS.

4. As per the allegations appearing in the FIR, a *black Scorpio* overtook the applicant at a very fast speed. When the complainant confronted the *Scorpio* Driver about his rash driving, the *Scorpio* Driver entered into altercation and started abusing him. He took out one base-ball bat from his vehicle and gave blows to the complainant. He fell unconscious. As per the allegations appearing in the FIR, the applicant, after the abovesaid incident, fled from the spot. The complainant, in injured condition, was admitted to a



hospital by a lady passerby.

5. Learned APP for the State submits that the stand taken by the applicant, during the period, he joined the investigation, its shifting, inconsistent and self contradictory on material aspects and his only intention is to mislead the investigation. According to him, during investigation, the offending vehicle was found to be a *Toyota Hyryder* and not the *Scorpio*, as claimed.

6. The accident took place on 18.11.2025 and, even as per the admitted case of prosecution, though the statement of the complainant was recorded on 26.11.2025, FIR was registered only on 17.12.2025.

7. On 18.11.2025, the complainant was, though, admitted in the hospital and was under treatment, he did not give any statement to the Police and claimed that he would make statement only after he is discharged from the hospital. Reference be made to GD No. 0005A dated 19.11.2025.

8. Even in the entire FIR, which was, eventually, registered on 17.12.2025, there is nothing to indicate that the accident in question was caused by *Toyota Hyryder* and, rather, it was mentioned that the accident was caused by a *black Scorpio*. Moreover, though the complaint, given by the complainant to the Police on 26.11.2025, did not indicate that the complainant was riding any motor cycle, during investigation, it was learnt that he was riding a motor cycle when he was overtaken by such black-coloured vehicle. The complainant did not give any other detail of the abovesaid vehicle and did not provide the police with the registration number of the abovesaid vehicle. As per his MLC also, he merely mentioned that he was hit by SUV.

9. It is, therefore, not very clear as to, on what basis, the police was able to reach the offending vehicle or its driver. The case diary would indicate that the Police relies upon one statement of HC Dharmender Singh and



supplementary statement of complainant. However, statement of HC Dharmender Singh was recorded as late as on 11.03.2026 and supplementary statement of Mohit Kataria is dated 24.03.2026 and, if at all, the type, or the exact make, of the offending vehicle, and name of the driver, was known to the complainant, it should have been apprised, without there being any delay in the matter. There is no CCTV Footage with respect to the spot or incident.

10. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case, the interim order dated 08.01.2026 is hereby made absolute and it is directed that the applicant would keep on assisting the Investigating Agency and would join the investigation as and when so directed and in the event of his arrest, he be released on bail by the concerned SHO/IO/arresting officer, on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond in a sum of Rs.25,000/-.

11. Needless to say, if the applicant does not join the investigation despite specific intimation given in writing in advance, the prosecution would be at liberty to approach this Court for seeking cancellation of bail.

12. The application stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

13. Pending application also stands disposed of.

14. It is, however, made clear that the observations made hereinabove are purely for the disposal of the present application and would not be taken as final expression over the merits of the case.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 11, 2026/sw/pb