



\$~90

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1256/2026**

ADITYA SINGH @ SURAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanket Agarwal, Advocate

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **01.04.2026**

CRL.M.A. 9880/2026 (exemption)

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

BAIL APPLN. 1256/2026

3. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 406/2025, registered at Police Station Kapashera, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 311/3(5)/317(2)/61(2)/345(3)/111/309(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Section 27/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959.
4. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case, as per the prosecution, are that on 08.10.2025, the complainant had gone to collect a payment of



₹26,50,000/- in cash and was already carrying ₹30,000/- in a black-coloured bag. It is stated that after collecting the said amount, while returning on his Scooty bearing registration No. DL-14TA-8577, with the bag placed in front of his feet, the complainant reached near Narayan Ashram, Peer Baba Chowk, Samalkha at about 1:10 PM. At that juncture, a Baleno car bearing registration number with last four digits '1127', which was already parked there, suddenly intercepted the complainant's path. One person alighted from the rear seat of the said car, brandished a pistol, and pointed the same at the complainant. Under threat of the said weapon, the assailant forcibly snatched the bag from the complainant's scooter and thereafter re-entered the vehicle while continuing to wave the pistol. It is also alleged that two other persons were present inside the said vehicle. Thereafter, all the accused persons fled from the spot.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is stated that the chargesheet in the present case stands filed before the learned Trial Court. It is further contended that the applicant is ready to join the investigation as and when required by the I.O. and he would cooperate in the investigation. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that proceedings for declaring the present accused, a proclaimed offender, have already been initiated under Section 84 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter '*BNSS*'), and the matter is listed for recording the statement of the process server. It is also argued that the pistol used in the commission of the offence has to be recovered from the applicant, for which his custodial interrogation is necessary. It is further argued that the applicant



has also been previously involved in three criminal cases registered at Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh. Therefore, it is prayed that the present anticipatory bail application be rejected.

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

8. In the present case, it is pertinent to note that proceedings under Section 84 of the BNSS have already been initiated against the applicant, and the matter is presently listed before the learned Trial Court for recording the statement of the process server.

9. It is further noted that raids were conducted by the Investigating Agency to apprehend the applicant; however, he could not be traced. The I.O. had also visited the residence of the applicant, but he was not found present there.

10. Having considered the facts of the case and the allegations against the applicant, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the applicant is required for the recovery of the alleged pistol used in threatening the complainant while snatching the bag containing money. This Court also notes that the co-accused persons are still absconding, and the custodial interrogation of the applicant is also necessary for their apprehension.

11. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

12. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

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



14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

APRIL 01, 2026/zp
rb