



\$~120

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1299/2026**

MANOJ SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kunal Vashist, Mr. Abhay
Gupta and Mr. Harsh Singh,
Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC (Crl.)
with Mr. Alok Sharma, Advocate.
SI Deepak.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

27.04.2026

1. By way of this writ petition, the petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

*“(a) grant the petitioner the interim protection till the next date of hearing i.e. 04.05.2026;
(b) Seeking clarification for the notification dated 18.03.2026 issued by The Delhi High Court whether the notification will apply retrospectively or not;
(b) pass such other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”*

2. The facts leading to the present petition are as follows:

a. The petitioner has applied for anticipatory bail before the learned Sessions Court, in proceedings arising out of FIR No. 39/2026 dated 23.01.2026, registered at Police Station Sunlight Colony, District South East, Delhi, under Sections 121/132/3(5) of the



Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

- b. Notice was issued in his application by the learned Sessions Court on 31.01.2026, and the application was listed for consideration/further proceedings on 03.03.2026.
 - c. On a further application being filed by him, he was granted interim protection from coercive action until 03.03.2026, by an order dated 03.02.2026.
 - d. However, 03.03.2026 was declared a holiday in the learned Sessions Court, and the application came up for hearing only on 11.04.2026.
 - e. On the said date, the learned Judge required the applicant to file an affidavit in terms of Practice Directions issued by this Court in the interregnum on 18.03.2026. The application has been put up for consideration on 04.05.2026.
3. The grievance with which the petitioner has approached this Court is that the interim protection granted to him *vide* order dated 03.02.2026 has not been expressly continued.
4. I have heard Mr. Kunal Vashist, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State.
5. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner was granted interim protection by the learned Sessions Court, and that the proceedings are pending for the reasons stated above, I am of the view that the interim protection is liable to be continued until the next date of hearing before the Sessions Court. It may be noted that the application was not taken up on the date fixed, i.e., 03.03.2026, as the said date was declared a holiday.



On the subsequent date of hearing, i.e., 11.04.2026, the Court required the petitioner to comply with Practice Directions, which had been issued by this Court after the bail application was filed. The Court has not vacated the interim order, but the petitioner apprehends that in the absence of an express extension, his liberty is imperilled. Such a course would be inappropriate, in the absence of any further consideration of his application by the Sessions Court.

6. It is therefore directed that the interim protection granted by order dated 03.02.2026 will continue until the next date of hearing before the Sessions Court, i.e., 04.05.2026. In the meantime, the petitioner will comply with the order of the learned Sessions Court dated 11.04.2026 on or before the next date of hearing.

7. Mr. Ansari submits that the petitioner has not joined the investigation. This contention is disputed. However, both parties are free to raise their respective contentions before the learned Sessions Court. It is made clear that this order is limited to consideration of the aspect recorded above, and this Court has rendered no opinion on the merits of the petitioner's application for anticipatory bail. That is a matter for the learned Sessions Court to consider.

8. The petition is disposed of in terms of the above.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 27, 2026
SS/JM/