



\$~139 & 14

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1325/2026**

MD FAISAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nehal A. Siddiquee, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State.
SI Sudhir Rathi, PS Gulabi Bagh.
SI Sanjay Nain, PS Civil Lines.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1223/2026**

RANJAN PANIT @ RANJAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nusrat Hossain and Ms.
Geetanjali, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State.
SI Sudhir Rathi, PS Gulabi Bagh.
SI Sanjay Nain, PS Civil Lines.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **15.05.2026**

1. By way of this application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicants seek regular bail in connection with FIR No. 171/2024 dated 12.07.2024, registered at Police Station Gulabi Bagh, District North, Delhi, under Sections



331(6)/310(2)/311/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

2. I have heard Mr. Nehal A. Siddiquee, learned counsel for the applicant in BAIL APPLN. 1325/2026; Ms. Nusrat Hossain, learned counsel for the applicant in BAIL APPLN. 1223/2026; and Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. Mr. Vali states, upon instructions from SI Sudhir Rathi, Police Station Gulabi Bagh, that, in terms of the directions issued in both these applications, the complainant was also informed of the pendency of the present proceedings by the then Investigating Officer [“IO”], SI Akash Deep.

4. The prosecution case, as it emerges from the material on record, is as follows:

- a. The FIR was registered at the instance of Mr. Dev Karan Anchaliya, stated to be an agent of the cash collection office of M/s Bikaner Assam Road Lines India Limited, which has its office at House No. 18/473, Flat No. 301, Third Floor, Mahaveer Bhawan, Nai Basti, Kishanganj, New Delhi.
- b. The complainant alleged that 8 persons entered the office at around 10:30 PM on 11.07.2024, and fled with cash of Rs. 30,00,000/-. The complainant later alleged that the total amount looted was to the tune of Rs. 4,08,00,000/-.
- c. The examination of proximate CCTV footage revealed that a group of 10 to 12 suspects were seen approaching the location from Pratap Nagar Metro Station, conducting reconnaissance of the area, and exiting the premises with bags filled with the looted cash.



Their arrival and departure are stated to have taken place in two vehicles – [i] silver Hyundai i10 bearing registration No. DL-7CK-5228, and [ii] a grey Honda Civic bearing registration No. DL-3CBM-8424.

- d. The status report enumerates recovery from twelve accused persons, who have been arrested. The table showing recoveries from each of the accused persons is reproduced below:

Sr. No.	Name of Accused	Date of Recovery	Recovered Amount (Rs.)
1	Kailash Singh Chauhan	16/7/24	14,00,000/-
2	Upendra Singh	16/7/24	14,00,000/-
3	Anuj Singh Tomar @ Ankush	16/7/24	25,00,000/-
4	Parmod Singh Tomar	16/7/24	25,00,000/-
5	Md. Faizal	17/7/24	17,54,000/-
6	Sanu Ali	17/7/24	20,00,000/-
7	Md. Tanzeem	18/7/24	21,48,000/-
8	Amit Kumar @ Badal	19/7/24	21,90,000/-
9	Naresh Kumar	19/7/24	7,89,000/-
10	Ranjan Pandit	19/7/24	31,94,500/-
11	Sachin Gupta	19/7/24	18,89,000/-
12	Jagdish Kumar @ Pitari	25/7/24	23,48,000/-
Total Amount Recovered			2,41,13,600/-
Yet to be Recovered			1,66,86,400/-

5. The principal argument of learned counsel for the applicants is based on parity with other co-accused persons who have already been granted bail. There are a total of 15 accused persons in the subject FIR, of



whom 7 have been granted bail – 2 by this Court and 5 by the Sessions Court. Learned counsel submits that the roles attributed to the present applicants are no graver than those attributed to the co-accused who have been granted bail. They have drawn my attention to the status report dated 21.04.2026 filed in BAIL APPLN. 1325/2026, wherein the role attributed to the said accused persons as well as the present applicants has been described as follows:

Sr. No.	Name of the Accused	Role	Court granting bail	Date of Order
1.	Upender Singh Chauhan	Passed on the information received from Kailash Singh Chauhan to his associates, Pramod Singh Chauhan and Anuj Singh Tomar @ Ankus. An amount of Rs. 14,00,000/- was recovered from him.	Sessions Court	30.01.2026
2.	Anuj Singh Tomar @ Ankus	Conducted reconnaissance of the scene of the crime along with Pramod Singh, Mohd. Tanzeem, Faisal, and Rajan Pandit. An amount of Rs. 25,00,000/- was recovered from him.	Sessions Court	06.02.2026
3.	Pramod Singh Chauhan	Participated in the planning and reconnaissance of the scene of the crime and helped mobilize the other accused persons for the robbery. An amount of Rs. 25,00,000/- was recovered from him.	High Court	26.02.2026
4.	Shanu Ali	Direct participant in the robbery, and acted on the instructions of the main conspirators. An amount of Rs. 20,00,000/- was recovered from him.	Sessions Court	03.05.2025
5.	Sachin Gupta	Played the role of a lookout and was responsible for keeping watch at the scene of the crime along with Najakat during the robbery. An amount of Rs. 18,89,000/- was recovered from him.	Sessions Court	03.07.2025
6.	Amit Kumar @ Badal	Actively participated in executing the robbery and acted in coordination with the other accused persons. An amount of Rs. 21,90,000/- was recovered from him.	High Court	20.03.2026



7.	Naresh Kumar	One of the robbers directly involved in the commission of the robbery. An amount of Rs. 7,89,600/- was recovered from him.	Sessions Court	30.11.2024
8.	Md. Faisal	Involved in both the reconnaissance and execution of the robbery at the scene of the crime. An amount of Rs. 17,54,050/- was recovered from him.	N.A.	N.A.
9.	Rajan Pandit	Participated in both the reconnaissance and execution of the robbery along with other team members. He also arranged for the involvement of co-accused persons, namely Naresh, Sachin, and Amit, in the commission of the dacoity. An amount of Rs. 31,94,500/- was recovered from him.	N.A.	N.A.

5. It is evident from the above that, in the case of Md. Faisal [Applicant in BAIL APPLN. 1325/2026], the allegation against him is that he was involved in the reconnaissance and execution of the robbery. The task of reconnaissance has also been attributed to Anuj Singh Tomar and Pramod Singh Chauhan, who have already been granted bail by the Sessions Court and this Court, respectively. Similarly, among those accused of having directly participated in the offence at the scene of crime, Shanu Ali and Naresh Kumar have been granted bail by the Sessions Court, and Amit Kumar @ Badal has been granted bail by this Court. It is also evident that substantial recoveries have been made from all the accused. Although there is no such allegation in the status report, Mr. Vali is instructed to state that Md. Faisal was also responsible for recruiting other participants. This allegation is also made against Pramod Singh Chauhan, who has been granted bail.

6. In the case of Ranjan Pandit [Applicant in BAIL APPLN.



1223/2026], the allegations are similar, i.e. participation in reconnaissance and execution of robbery as well as arranging for other participants.

7. On a holistic consideration, I do not find the allegations against the present applicants to be substantially different from the allegations against those accused who have been granted bail, whether by this Court or the Sessions Court. Those orders have all been accepted by the prosecution.

8. The applicants have already spent approximately 1 year and 10 months in custody, having been arrested on 17/18.07.2024. Although Mr. Vali states, upon instructions, that there is previous criminal involvement in the case of Md. Faisal, this is not reflected in the Nominal Roll or the status report, and Mr. Siddiquee has denied the assertion. In any event, the Supreme Court has held in *Prabhakar Tewari v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.* [(2020) 11 SCC 648] that previous involvement need not, in all cases, lead to denial of bail to an accused.

9. Having regard to the above factors, I am of the view that the applicants are entitled to the concession of bail at par with the co-accused. It is, therefore, directed that the applicants be released on bail in connection with FIR No. 171/2024 dated 12.07.2024, registered at Police Station Gulabi Bagh, District North, Delhi, under Sections 331(6)/310(2)/311/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959, subject to furnishing of a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 35,000/- each, with one surety each of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, and subject to the following further conditions:



- a. The applicants shall appear before the Sessions Court on each and every date fixed.
 - b. The applicants shall ordinarily reside at the address as per prison records, and shall not change the address without informing the concerned IO/Station House Officer [“SHO”].
 - c. The applicants shall provide their mobile numbers to the concerned IO/SHO, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The mobile numbers shall not be switched off or changed without prior intimation to the IO during the pendency of the trial.
 - d. If the applicants have a passport, they shall surrender the same to the learned Sessions Court, and shall not leave the country without the prior permission of the learned Sessions Court.
 - e. The applicants shall not, directly or indirectly, contact, visit, nor offer any inducement, threat, or promise to any of the prosecution witnesses or other persons acquainted with the facts of the case.
 - f. The applicants shall not tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial.
 - g. The applicants shall not commit any offence during the period of their release.
10. The bail applications are disposed of in terms of the above.
11. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail applications, and shall neither influence the trial proceedings, nor be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
12. Copy of the order be communicated to the concerned Jail



Superintendent electronically for information and necessary compliance.

MAY 15, 2026
'pv/KA'/'

PRATEEK JALAN, J