



\$~10

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 684/2026**

RANJEET SINGH

.....Applicant

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

versus

STATE OF DELHI NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, APP with Mr. Upasana Bakshi, Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh, Mr. Divya Bakshi and Mr. Gourav Singh, Adv. Insp. Vivek Singh, PS: Alipur
Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Nandeesh Nanda and Mr. Shivom Sethi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **20.04.2026**

1. Learned APP for State has handed over the Status Report, which is taken on record.
2. By virtue of the present application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in proceedings arising out of FIR No.637/2022 dated 24.09.2022 registered at PS: Alipur under *Sections 302/34* of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*IPC*).
3. *Succinctly put*, as per prosecution, the FIR was registered upon the receipt of information on 24.09.2022 at about 09:30AM about a dead body of an unknown male person aged about 20-30 years with multiple injuries



on his body discovered lying on Shahpur Alipur Road, who was declared brought dead at BJRM Hospital where he was taken by the Police. Subsequent investigation including analysis of nearby CCTV cameras and recording of statements of witnesses revealed that the applicant herein along with the other co-accused persons had brought the deceased to the area during the intervening night of 23/24.09.2022 at about 01:00 AM and brutally assaulted him with fists, kicks and pipes for a long period of time. The applicant was then traced and arrested on 03.10.2022. Since then, not only the chargesheet has been filed but the charges under *Sections 302/24 IPC* have also been framed against the accused persons including the applicant herein.

4. In these facts, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case as there are no cogent materials against him as no recovery has been actually made at his instance, since the alleged seizure memo *qua* the weapons does not mention any seal, as also since the statement of the witness who allegedly saw the deceased being unloaded by the applicant and the co-accused pertains to the wrong date, i.e. one day prior to the date of the incident as per the FIR. He further submits that of the three eye-witnesses, one has already turned hostile, yet his examination is pending since 04.05.2024 for want of the FSL reports *qua* the CCTV footage. As a result whereof, the applicant has been languishing in prison for over the past *three and a half years*, and yet, since only *14 of the 34 prosecution witnesses* have been examined till date, it is likely to get prolonged further. He lastly submits that the applicant does not have any criminal antecedents and is the sole bread earner of his family, hence he may be released on regular bail.



5. *Per contra*, learned APP for State opposes grant of bail to the applicant since the offence alleged is heinous in nature, the applicant and the co-accused beat the deceased till he succumbed to his injuries. He further submits that there is a strong *prima facie* case against the accused since both the car captured in the CCTV camera which has been identified by the eye witnesses as well as the weapon of assault involved have been recovered at his instance along with the other co-accused. In fact, even the CDR shows his presence at the scene of the crime during the time of commission of the offence. He lastly submits that two other co-accused are currently absconding and have even been declared proclaimed offenders, and still the eye-witnesses are remaining to be examined.

6. Heard. Perused the record as well.

7. There can be no dispute that the offences alleged to have been committed by the applicant are grave and serious in nature, as also that while considering an application for grant of regular bail, this Court is not sitting in evidence to appreciate the material(s) on record, or the examination of the witnesses, or dispute *qua* the recovery, etc.

8. Moreover, the contentions raised by learned counsel for the applicant have to be weighed against the CCTV footage capturing the presence of the applicant and the recovery of both weapons, as also the CDR connecting him. Record reveals that the trial is at a sensitive stage as the eye-witnesses are yet to be examined before the learned Trial Court, and also that two of the co-accused persons are already absconding. The same assumes significance as one eye-witness has already turned hostile. If anything, there is a potential risk of the applicant intimidating the eye-witnesses as also other witnesses and tampering with the evidence if



released on bail as also absconding and being untraceable pending trial.

9. Thus, bearing in mind the overall facts and circumstances, as also the well-settled considerations *qua* grant of regular bail [***Manik Madhukar Sarve & Ors. vs. Vitthal Damuji Meher & Ors.:(2024) 10 SCC 753, Zeba Khan vs. State of U.P. & Ors.:2026 INSC 144***], a fit case for releasing the applicant on bail is not made out at this stage.

10. However, considering that the applicant has been under incarceration for nearly *three and a half years* and the FSL Report is still awaited, keeping in view the fundamental right of the accused to a speedy trial, the Principal Director of the FSL Home Department is requested to ensure that the concerned FSL Report in the proceedings arising out of FIR No.637/2022 dated 24.09.2022 registered at PS: Alipur under *Sections 302/34 IPC* is prepared and submitted at the earliest possible opportunity, preferably within a period of *four weeks* from the date of this order.

11. A copy of this order be sent to the Principal Director, FSL Home Department, Govt. of NCT of Delhi, Madhuban Chowk, Rohini Sector-14, Delhi-110085 for necessary information and compliance.

12. The present application is dismissed, *albeit*, with the aforesaid directions.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

APRIL 20, 2026/Ab