



\$~7

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 598/2026**

ANUJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Kanhaiya Singhal, Mr Prasanna,
Mr Kuntal, Mr Prashant Kumar, Mr
Dinesh Kumar, Mr Rishabh
Bhardwaj, Ms Ssingh, Ms Avantika
Shankar and Mr. Deepak Khattar,
Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

30.04.2026

CRL.M.A. 11507/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 598/2026 & CRL.M.A. 11417/2026

3. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 03/2026, registered at Police Station Mangolpuri, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Section 103(1)/109(1)/190/191(2)/191(3)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').
4. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 01.01.2026, a



PCR call was received at Police Station Mangolpuri vide DD No. 210A regarding a stabbing incident at Gali No. 4, Mangolpuri, wherein it was reported that a boy had sustained knife injuries and was bleeding. The said information was marked to SI Tarun Kumar, who, upon reaching the spot, found blood scattered at the scene; however, the caller was not present. The Crime Team was accordingly summoned, the spot was inspected, and exhibits were lifted and seized as per procedure. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that the injured persons had already been shifted to Sanjay Gandhi Memorial Hospital, Mangolpuri. SI Tarun Kumar reached the hospital and collected MLC No. 204/26 pertaining to an unknown person, who was subsequently identified as Vikash @ Bihari, and MLC No. 205/26 of injured Sandeep. As per MLC No. 204/26, the injured Vikash was brought to the hospital in an unconscious and unresponsive condition and was declared “brought dead” at 10:59 PM on the same day. MLC No. 205/26 recorded that injured Sandeep had sustained injuries in a physical assault at D-Block, Chhidi Wala Park, Mangolpuri. Accordingly, the present FIR was registered. During investigation, five Children in Conflict with Law (CCLs), i.e. (1) An, (2) K, (3) Ad, (4) P, and (5) K, were apprehended and sent to protective custody, as they were clearly visible in the CCTV footage of the place of incident. Thereafter, present applicant Anuj and co-accused Vishal @ Ghoda were also arrested.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role whatsoever in the commission of the alleged offence. It is contended that the applicant was not present at the spot at the time of the alleged incident and that no recovery has been effected from or at the instance of the applicant. It



is further argued that the applicant was illegally detained by the police on 01.01.2026, though he has been shown to have been apprehended on 02.01.2026, which casts serious doubt on the authenticity of the arrest memo, which is a fabricated document. It is also argued that the grounds of arrest were not furnished to the applicant at the time of arrest and that his family members were not duly informed. Emphasis is also laid on the fact that the applicant is a young boy aged about 19 years. On these grounds, it is prayed that the applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

6. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the State argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is argued that due intimation of the applicant's arrest was given to his family, and upon learning that his father had expired, his mother was duly informed. The learned APP further contends that there is CCTV footage of the incident wherein the applicant is clearly visible in the company of co-accused persons. It is also argued that there is an injured eye-witness, Sandeep, who has specifically named the applicant and his associates as the perpetrators and has expressed apprehension of threat to his life in the event of the applicant being released on bail. It is further argued that the investigation is at an initial stage, as the FSL report is still awaited. In these circumstances, it is argued 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 material available on record.

8. Having heard the rival contentions and perused the case file, this Court finds that the allegations against the applicant are that on 01.01.2026, he, along with co-accused persons, had caught hold of the deceased Vikash



@ Bihari while co-accused Vishal @ Ghoda had inflicted knife blows upon him, resulting in his death, and that the injured eye-witness Sandeep was also present at the spot and had sustained injuries during the said incident.

9. This Court further notes that there is *prima facie* material on record in the form of CCTV footage, wherein the applicant is stated to be visible in the company of other co-accused persons at the time of the incident. It is also material to note that the statement of the injured eye-witness Sandeep was recorded by the I.O., who has stated that there had been a prior altercation between him and one of the CCLs a few months prior to the incident, on account of which the said CCL was harbouring a grudge. He has further alleged that on 01.01.2026, when he and the deceased were present at the park, the applicant Anuj, along with co-accused persons, had reached there, and that the applicant, along with a CCL, had caught hold of the deceased while co-accused Vishal @ Ghoda had inflicted knife blows, which proved fatal. The weapon of offence, i.e. knife was recovered from the possession of co-accused Vishal.

10. As regards the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant regarding alleged illegal detention and discrepancy in the arrest memo, this Court notes that, *firstly*, written grounds of arrest were furnished to the applicant at the time of arrest, which were also perused by the concerned court at the time of remand. *Secondly*, no such objection appears to have been raised at the time of initial remand as apparent from order dated 03.01.2026, nor has the remand order been challenged by the applicant. There is also no material on record at this stage to prove that the applicant had been arrested or detained prior to the time reflected in the arrest memo.



Thus, no ground for grant of bail is made out on this count.

11. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the opinion that the allegations against the applicant are grave in nature, involving a fatal stabbing incident resulting in the death of the victim. The investigation is still at an initial stage, the FSL report is awaited, and the charges are yet to be framed. The injured eye-witness has also expressed apprehension to his life in the event of the applicant being released on bail.

12. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

13. The present application is, accordingly, dismissed.

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

15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

APRIL 30, 2026/A
TD