



\$~37

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1390/2026, CRL.M.A. 10972/2026**

ARMAN ALIAS FARMAN

.....Applicant

Through: **Mr. Sunil Kumar, Adv.**

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: **Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for the
State with Ms. Vanshika Singh and
Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, Advocates
SI Sharmila Yadav, PS.: Gulabi
Bagh, Delhi**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

10.04.2026

CRL.M.A. 10972/2026 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed.

BAIL APPLN. 1390/2026

3. By virtue of the present application under *Section 482* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.175/2025 dated 19.06.2025 registered at PS.: Gulabi Bagh, Delhi under *Sections 304(2)/3(5)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (**BNS**).
4. *Succinctly put*, on 19.06.2025, the complainant was going to drop her child to his tuition class whence the co-accused and the applicant working in tandem stole the gold chain of the complainant and fled



therefrom. Since the entire incident was recorded on the CCTV footage, the present FIR was registered. During investigation, as per the disclosure statement of the co-accused, it was revealed that the applicant is the receiver of the stolen chain as also the same has been pledged by him for Rs.17,000/-. Pursuant thereto, although attempts were made to contact the applicant for investigation by virtue of three notices under *Section 35(3)* of the BNSS, however neither of them were responded by him.

5. Issue notice. Learned APP for the State accepts notice.

6. Of the various grounds raised by the applicant, learned counsel for the applicant primarily submits that the notice/ summon dated 10.09.2025 in the name of the applicant were issued at a wrong address, and thus the applicant being unserved was unaware of the proceedings emanating therefrom.

7. Learned APP for the State has handed over a copy of the Status Report which is taken on record. Based thereon, learned APP, primarily, opposes the grant of anticipatory bail, since, despite being duly served with notices under *Section 35(3)* of the BNSS there was no appearance on his behalf, and also since the applicant has long been declared a Proclaimed Offender under *Section 84* of the BNSS on 25.10.2015, neither any steps have been taken qua the same nor he has appeared thereafter to joined investigation. As such, she prays for dismissal of the present application, more so, since his custodial interrogation is required for the recovery of the stolen gold chain.

8. Heard.

9. This Court finds that the contentions *qua* non receipt of the summon dated 10.09.2025 were never raised before as there no whisper qua them



when the earlier application seeking grant of anticipatory bail was dismissed by the learned Trial Court on 12.09.2025 nor whence he withdrew his subsequent application seeking grant of anticipatory bail (BAIL APPL.4313/2025) on 12.11.2025. Moreover, it is an admitted position that the applicant has never sought the grant of anticipatory bail before the learned Trial Court thereafter and straightaway has approached this Court. Also, considerable period of time (*six months*) has lapsed since he has been declared as a Proclaimed Offender.

10. In view thereof, no case for releasing the applicant on anticipatory bail is made out, and the present application is, thus, dismissed.

11. The observations expressed hereinabove, if any, being tentative in nature, will not come in the way of any subsequent proceedings, which shall be dealt on their own merits.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

APRIL 10, 2026/bh