



\$~8

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 706/2026**

TILAK RAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sarthak Tomar, Advocate

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

21.05.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 691/2024, registered at Police Station Mahendra Park, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 109(1)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter '*BNS*').
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that allegations against the present accused/applicant are that the applicant had caused stab injuries to the injured.
3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the matter has been settled between the parties. It is stated that the co-accused Vijay Raj and Mukesh Raj have already been granted regular bail in this case on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties. Therefore, it is prayed that the present application be for regular bail be allowed.



4. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that allegations levelled against the present accused/applicant are serious in nature. It is argued that the applicant herein had inflicted stab injuries with knife on the chest of the injured. It is, therefore, prayed that the present bail application for grant of regular bail be dismissed.

5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State and has perused the material available on record.

6. The allegations against the present accused/applicant are that the accused and the complainant had some money disputes over business and on the day of incident, the applicant had caused stab injuries to the injured. The injured is present in the court and states that he has settled the matter with the accused.

7. The learned Sessions Judge has also recorded in its order dated 02.02.2026 that the complainant had appeared before it and had stated that he has settled the matter with the accused, however, has been pleased to reject the bail application of the applicant on the ground witnesses has not been examined.

8. In this case, the complainant himself entered into compromise with the present applicant at this stage itself.

9. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the complainant has himself entered into compromise, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant herein, on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms and conditions:



- i) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court and if the applicant has a passport, he shall surrender the same to the concerned trial court.
 - ii) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court and IO/SHO concerned.
 - iii) The applicant shall appear regularly before the learned Trial Court, unless exempted.
 - iv) The applicant shall not communicate with, or come into contact with the complainant or any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.
10. Accordingly, the present bail application stands allowed and is disposed of.
11. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 21, 2026/zp