



\$~49

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1199/2026**

KUNAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Rai, Ms. Parmeshwari
Kumari Dhayal, Mr. Aman Dalal, Ms.
Shruti Agrawal, Mr. Aman Kumar
and Mr. Dinesh Chand Meena, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

27.03.2026

CRL.M.A. 9261/2026 (exemption)

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

BAIL APPLN. 1199/2026

3. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 725/2025, registered at Police Station Bawana, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 109(1)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Section 25/27 of Arms Act, 1959.
4. The brief facts of the case, as per the prosecution, are that on 07.12.2025, a PCR call was received at PS Bawana regarding firing by three



unknown persons riding a black Splendor motorcycle, who had allegedly attempted to shoot the caller. Upon reaching the spot, one empty cartridge was recovered and seized. Thereafter, the complainant, Yamin, gave his statement stating that on 08.12.2025, while he was on his scooter near Sultanpur, three boys, whom he had seen earlier with co-accused Mohit Dahiya, rammed their motorcycle into his scooter, causing him to fall. It is alleged that two of them took out pistols and fired 3–4 shots at him with an intention to kill, however, he managed to escape and informed the police.

5. During investigation, the complainant expressed suspicion that the attack was orchestrated by Vicky Dabas @ Haddal, along with Rahul and Mohit Dahiya, due to prior enmity and threats extended to him. The present applicant, Kunal, was arrested on 14.12.2025. As per the prosecution, he, along with co-accused persons, had conspired to commit the offence and, on the day of the incident, had driven the motorcycle and hit the complainant's scooter, after which the co-accused fired gunshots at the complainant. The applicant was identified by the complainant in TIP proceedings. Other co-accused persons were subsequently arrested, and the charge sheet has been filed *qua* the present applicant.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the Status Report incorrectly records that recovery of the weapon of offence was effected from the present applicant, whereas no such recovery has in fact been made. The learned counsel further submits that charges have not yet been framed in the present case. It is also argued that the applicant is a first-year LL.B. student, has no previous criminal antecedents, and that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, it is prayed



that the applicant be admitted to bail.

7. The learned APP for the State fairly submits that it has been inadvertently mentioned in the Status Report that recovery was effected from the present applicant, whereas no such recovery has been made from him. It is also not disputed that charges have not yet been framed. However, it is contended that the allegations against the present applicant are serious in nature, and thus, the present bail application deserves to be rejected.

8. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has perused the case file.

9. After hearing arguments and perusing the material on record, this Court is of the opinion that no injury was caused to the complainant in the present case. This Court also notes that no recovery was effected from the possession of the present accused/applicant, and that the applicant has no criminal antecedents. It is further noted that charges have not yet been framed in the present case. The applicant is pursuing LL.B. and is a first-year student. Moreover, he has been in judicial custody since 14.12.2025.

10. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant, on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.15,000/- 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.

11. Accordingly, the present bail application stands disposed of.

12. 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 27, 2026/ns/A
TD