



\$~96

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1086/2026**

SALMAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akshay Bedi, Advocate

versus

THE STATE OF GNCT DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

18.03.2026

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 686/2025, registered at Police Station Nand Nagri, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 103/238/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 08.11.2025, a PCR call *vide* DD No. 103A was received at P.S. Nand Nagri regarding an injured person lying in B-1 Park, near BDA School, Nand Nagri, Delhi. Upon reaching the spot, the Investigating Officer had found a male, aged about 27 years, lying dead on an iron bench inside the park, and the body was found tied to the bench with a black cable wire, and blood was oozing from his head. Four empty cartridges (7.65 KF) were found lying nearby. The deceased was later identified as Sunny by his brother, Lovely Mehra.



An e-rickshaw belonging to the deceased was also found parked outside the park near the gate. The dead body was thereafter sent to GTB Hospital, where he was declared “brought dead.”

3. During investigation, statements of eye-witnesses were recorded. As per one such eye-witness, on 08.11.2025 at about 5:35 PM, the deceased Sunny was confronted by co-accused Ravi Sharma, Ravi Kumar, and other persons, who objected to his presence in the area. It is alleged that co-accused Ravi Sharma accused the deceased of being involved in the murder of his brother, Rameshwar @ Chhutanki, and assaulted him. Thereafter, co-accused Pooja Sharma also reached the spot, instigated the co-accused persons to beat the deceased, and left. Subsequently, the deceased was taken inside the park, tied to a bench, and co-accused Ravi Sharma, after briefly leaving the spot, returned with a pistol and fired multiple shots at the deceased, resulting in his death. Thereafter, the accused persons fled from the spot.

4. During further investigation, co-accused Ravi Sharma disclosed that he had befriended the present applicant, Salman @ Bhasuri, while in jail, and had requested him to arrange a firearm for committing the murder of the deceased. It is alleged that upon their release, the present applicant supplied a pistol, along with cartridges and magazines, to co-accused Ravi Sharma on 09.08.2025 at his residence. It is further alleged that the applicant was using a SIM card issued in the name of his brother, and CDR analysis revealed that he had been in contact with co-accused Ravi Sharma on multiple occasions prior to the incident. The location of the said mobile number also places the applicant near the residence of co-accused Ravi Sharma on



09.08.2025.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the present accused/applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been arrested solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Ravi Sharma. It is contended that no recovery has been effected from the possession of the present applicant and that the only allegation against him is that he had supplied a firearm to the co-accused, which is not supported by any evidence. It is stated that the chargesheet already stands filed and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant behind bars. It is, therefore, prayed that the present applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

6. The learned APP for the State on the other hand argues that the present applicant had supplied the weapon of offence, i.e., a pistol along with 20 cartridges, to co-accused Ravi Sharma, who allegedly used the said weapon to commit the murder of the deceased. It is further argued that the present applicant is a habitual offender and was an active participant in the conspiracy, having facilitated the commission of the offence by providing the weapon. It is stated that charges are yet to be framed in this case and material witnesses are yet to be examined before the Court. It is, therefore, prayed that the present bail application be rejected.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State, and has perused the material on record.

8. In the present case, the allegations against the applicant, briefly, are that he had facilitated the commission of the offence by supplying the



weapon of offence, i.e., a pistol along with cartridges and magazines, to co-accused Ravi Sharma. The said weapon was allegedly used in the commission of the murder of the deceased. The CDR analysis in the case further reveals that the applicant was in continuous contact with the co-accused prior to the incident, and his location has been found near the residence of the co-accused at the relevant time, which *prima facie* corroborates the case of prosecution at this stage.

9. This Court also notes that the applicant herein is involved in as many as 10 criminal cases of serious nature, out of which in several cases the use of arms has been alleged. Such antecedents, at this stage, cannot be ignored while considering the prayer for grant of bail. As noted above, the material on record, including the disclosure statement of the co-accused and the supporting electronic evidence in the form of CDR analysis, *prima facie* indicates the role of the present applicant in facilitating the commission of the offence.

10. Further, it is also pertinent to note that the charges are yet to be framed in the present case. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to undertake a detailed appreciation of evidence at this stage. However, having regard to the nature of allegations, the role attributed to the applicant, and the material available on record, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of regular bail at this stage.

11. The bail application is accordingly dismissed.

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



13. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MARCH 18, 2026/A
TD