



\$~16

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 630/2026**

LUCKY

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Pawan Silmana, Adv. (Through
VC)

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for
the State with Mr. Ashish Mahani
and Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh,
Adv.

Mr. Kartavya Batra, Adv. for R-2
(Through VC)

SI- Ajeet Singh, PS: Wazirabad

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER
16.03.2026

%

1. By virtue of the present bail application under *Section 482* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant namely Lucky seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.0961/2025 dated 06.12.2025 registered at PS.: Wazirabad, Delhi under *Sections 109(1)/3(5)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (**BNS**).

2. *Briefly put*, as per prosecution the aforesaid FIR was registered on the complaint of the complainant Naresh who alleged that on 15.12.2025, accused Dheeraj, his younger brother and other associates stabbed him. During investigation, it was further revealed by the complainant that all three of them, and one child in conflict with law had injured him by



stabbing with the intention to kill him so as to settle the old scores.

3. In these facts, learned counsel for the applicant praying for anticipatory bail submits that *[i]* the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case inasmuch as the applicant has not been named in the FIR and there are no CCTV footage or independent credible witnesses to show that the applicant was present at the place of the incident; *[ii]* no specific act/ role has been attributed to the applicant and the only vague allegations has been made against him that he was accompanying his brother Dheeraj, who stabbed the complainant; and *[iii]* there was prior enmity between the applicant's family and complainant since the father of the applicant has earlier filed an FIR bearing no.275/2019 under *sections 308/323/341/506/34 IPC* at PS: Wazirabad against the complainant.

4. Learned APP for the State has handed over a copy of the Status Report, which is taken on record. Based thereon, he submits that *[i]* the role and the name of the applicant has come to light on the basis of the subsequent investigation where the complainant has categorically named the main accused Dheeraj and two of his brothers, including the applicant, who were involved in stabbing him to settle old scores; *[ii]* his location during the incident was in Wazirabad; *[iii]* this is a case where the complainant received serious injuries and was in ICU for several days; and *[iv]* though he joined investigation but he has neither co-operated nor participated therein.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant, relying upon the statement of the complainant, submits that it was the applicant who grabbed the complainant when his brother Dheeraj was stabbing him.

6. Heard learned counsels for the parties as also learned APP for the



State, as also gone through the documents on record.

7. *Holistically* considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, *prima facie*, this Court is not convinced with the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant, particularly, since as per the Investigating Officer the location of the applicant during the fateful incident was in Wazirabad. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the applicant was very much there and was actively involved in the brutal incident. Lastly, the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered.

8. Under these circumstances, the applicant is not entitled to grant anticipatory bail and, thus, the present bail application is dismissed.

9. The observations hereinabove, being tentative in nature, will not come in the way of any subsequent proceedings, which shall be dealt on their own merits.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

MARCH 16, 2026/Ab