



\$~61

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 523/2026 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1069/2026**

SANDEEP BIDHURI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arjun Mahajan with Mr.
Raghvendra N. Budholia, Mr. Shahbaj
Singh, Mr. Harshit Kapoor, Ms.
Bhavya Arora, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

29.05.2026

The present matter has been listed today *i.e.* 29.05.2026, since 28.05.2026 was declared a holiday.

2. By way of the present petition filed under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.0515/2025 dated 30.08.2025 registered under sections 103(1)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 at P.S.: Kalkaji, South East Delhi.
3. Notice on this petition was issued *vidé* order dated 05.02.2026.
4. Status Report dated 27.03.2026 has been filed in the matter.
5. Nominal Roll dated 25.05.2026 has been received from the concerned Jail Superintendent.
6. Pursuant to intimation issued *vidé* order dated 05.05.2026, the nephew of the deceased, who is the complainant in the subject FIR, is present in court. He states that the next-of-kin of the deceased victim are his minor children and wife, who are not in a position to represent the deceased.



7. The matter arises from the murder of one Yogendera Singh by an unlawful assembly of persons on 29.08.2025 at about 08:30 a.m. in the complex of Kalkaji temple, New Delhi, where the victim served as a *sewadar*.
8. As narrated by the complainant in the subject FIR, the genesis of the dispute is that at around 05:00 p.m. on 29.08.2025 an altercation had occurred between the victim and one Mohan Bidhuri *alias* Bhura and one Yash Bidhuri, who had come to the temple for *darshan*. The reason for the altercation was that Mohan @ Bhura and Yash Bidhuri were forcibly removed from the temple premises by the victim and his associates. It is also narrated in the subject FIR that on being forcibly removed from the temple premises, Mohan @ Bhura had threatened to retaliate against the complainant and his deceased uncle. It is alleged that thereafter, between 07:15 p.m. and 8:45 p.m. all accused persons, except Babu and Anil Pandey, assembled at one Sky Light Cafe near the Kalkaji temple, *which cafe is co-owned by the petitioner herein*, and conspired to take revenge for the humiliation of Mohan @ Bhura and Yash Bidhuri at the hands of the victim.
9. Mr. Arjun Mahajan, learned counsel for the petitioner submits, that a perusal of the chargesheet would show that the only allegation against the petitioner - Sandeep Bidhuri is that he was *seen approaching the scene of the crime* from the side of the temple.
10. Mr. Mahajan also submits, that the only electronic evidence in relation to the petitioner's alleged role, is some CCTV footage, which shows that the petitioner was *only walking along the road* coming from the side of



the temple when other accused persons were beating the victim on the road side.

11. Mr. Mahajan further points-out, that the CCTV footage clearly shows that the petitioner was merely a passerby and has been implicated in the matter only because he runs the café in which the other accused persons are alleged to have met and conspired to murder the victim.
12. The CCTV footage has been played in court.
13. Learned counsel further submits, that though 02 eye-witnesses have been cited by the prosecution in support of their case, their statements would also do not disclose that the petitioner had any role in the offence.
14. Most importantly, Mr. Mahajan submits, that one of the main accused *i.e.*, Babu has already been admitted to regular bail by the learned sessions court *vidé* order dated 17.01.2026, whereas the petitioner has been languishing in custody for the last about 09 months. A copy of order dated 17.01.2026 has been shown to the court.
15. In response to what has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner, the court has also heard Mr. Nagesh, the complainant who is the nephew of the deceased, who submits that while the CCTV footage relates to what happened *outside* Ramkumar Bharadwaj Dharamshala, Kalkaji Mandir, the petitioner was one of the persons who had *earlier assaulted* the victim *inside* the Dharamshala.
16. Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP appearing for the State has placed reliance on his status report to submit, that since there was no CCTV footage available from inside the Dharamshala, the role ascribed to the petitioner of having assaulted the victim, is based on the statements of the eye-witnesses. Insofar as the CCTV footage of outside the



Dharamshala is concerned, on instructions of the I.O., learned APP submits, that the petitioner can be seen with a stick in his hand when the other co-accused were assaulting the victim with sticks and blows.

17. Upon a conspectus of the foregoing, considering the role ascribed to the petitioner in the chargesheet; in view of what is seen in the CCTV footage played in court; and the position that the petitioner has already suffered about 09 months of judicial custody as an undertrial, with no other criminal antecedents, this court is persuaded to allow the present petition.

18. Accordingly, the petitioner – **Sandeep Bidhuri s/o Nem Chand Bidhuri** – is admitted to *regular bail* pending trial *subject to* the following conditions:

18.1. The petitioner shall furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rs. Twenty-five Thousand Only) with 02 sureties in the like amount from family members, to the satisfaction of the learned trial court;

18.2. The petitioner shall furnish to the Investigating Officer/S.H.O, P.S.: Kalkaji, South-East Delhi a cellphone number on which the petitioner may be contacted at any time and shall ensure that the number is kept active and switched-on at all times;

18.3. If the petitioner has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the learned trial court and shall not travel out of the country without prior permission of the learned trial court;

18.4. The petitioner shall not contact, nor visit, nor offer any inducement, threat or promise to any of the prosecution witnesses or other persons acquainted with the facts of case. The petitioner



shall not tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that is unlawful or that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial; and

18.5. In case of any change in his residential address/contact details, the petitioner shall promptly inform the Investigating Officer in writing.

19. Since the petitioner is facing trial and would therefore be appearing before the learned trial court from time-to-time, it is not considered necessary to impose a reporting requirement as a condition of regular bail.
20. Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the pending matter.
21. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent *forthwith*.
22. The petition stands disposed-of in the above terms.
23. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MAY 29, 2026

ds