



\$~83

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1739/2026**

SALMAN QURESHI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikram Singh Pawar, Mr. Dinesh Bhaduria, Mr. Utkarsh Soni, Mr. Jai Choudhary and Mr. Siddharth Goyal, Advocates

versus

STATE (GNCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **05.05.2026**

CRL.M.A. 14024/2026 & CRL.M.A. 14025/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stand disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1739/2026

3. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 001/2026, registered at Police Station GTB Enclave, Delhi for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 311/3(5)/324(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Section 25/27 of Arms Act, 1959.
4. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that the present FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, who alleged that while



he was present outside Lamour Cafe, Jhilmil Industrial Area, Shahdara, Delhi, he was intercepted by 3–4 persons. It is alleged that one of the accused persons placed a pistol on his chest, while another snatched his gold chain. Upon resistance by the complainant, the accused persons allegedly opened fire and fled from the spot after also causing damage to his vehicle. A PCR call was made, pursuant to which the police reached the spot, and the crime team as well as the forensic team were called. During the inspection, two empty cartridges were recovered from the spot and were seized. During the course of investigation, raids were conducted to apprehend the accused persons, and CCTV footage of the incident was obtained and examined. The footage allegedly revealed the presence of the accused along with their associates, who were carrying weapons such as *dandas* and firearms. Further, the mobile location of the accused was found to be at the place of occurrence at the relevant time.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role to play in the alleged incident. It is argued that the main accused in the present case has already been granted bail *vide* order dated 20.03.2026 by this Court. It is also argued that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 12.02.2026, and the trial will take considerable time to conclude. It is therefore prayed that the applicant be released on regular bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, has opposed the present bail application and submits that the CCTV footage of the incident clearly captures the presence of the applicant at the spot, and his face is visible therein, which corroborates the prosecution's case. It is further submitted that the CDR of the applicant also place him at the scene of



occurrence at the relevant time, thereby strengthening the case against him. It is thus prayed that in view of the gravity of the offence and the material available on record, the present application be dismissed.

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

8. This Court notes that co-accused Badal has already been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Court *vide* order dated 09.03.2026, and co-accused Vikash has been granted regular bail by this Court *vide* order dated 20.03.2026, both of whom are stated to have a role similar to that of the present applicant.

9. It is also pertinent to note that the gold chain allegedly stolen by the applicant, along with other co-accused persons, was recovered from the car of the complainant, who had informed the police in this regard.

10. This Court further notes that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 12.02.2026, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude.

11. In view of foregoing discussion, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- with two sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the 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 he has passport, he shall surrender the same to the concerned trial court.
- ii) The applicant shall share his contact details (mobile numbers



and residential address) with the IO/SHO and the Trial Court; and in case of any change in the said details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court and the concerned IO/SHO.

- iii) The applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on every date of hearing 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.
12. Accordingly, the present bail application is disposed of.
13. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/zp
rb



\$~11

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1629/2026**

NAKUL GODARA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Lal Singh Thakur, Advocate with
Mr. Sahil Gandhi, Mr. Tarun Maan,
Mr. Ankush Saini, Mr. Aditya, Mr.
Lokesh, Mr. Sumit, Ms. Kavya, Ms.
Himani and Ms. Sonali, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State with
SI Ekta, PS: Sector 23 Dwarka.
Dr. Narwesh C. Sharma, Advocate
with Mr. Ajaury Sharma and Mr.
Anurag Malik, Advocates for
complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

05.05.2026

%

1. During the course of arguments, both parties agree to make an endeavour to amicably settle the matter. They further request that the matter be referred to Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre (SAMADHAN) for mediation.
2. Accordingly, both the parties are directed to appear before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre (SAMADHAN), on 06.05.2025 at 2.30 PM and try to sincerely settle all the disputes between them.



3. Re-notify the matter on 12.05.2026.
4. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/vc
TD



\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1463/2026**

GOPAL MITTAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chetan Bhardwaj, Ms. Priyal Bhardwaj and Ms. Swati Gaur, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.
Mr. Himanshu Kundu, Mr. Shitanshu Saklani and Mr. Naved Ali, Advocates for complainant/respondent no. 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

05.05.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of interim bail for a period of 45 days in case arising out of FIR No. 498/2024, registered at Police Station Special Cell, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 318(4)/319(2)/61(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter '*BNS*').
2. Issue notice. The learned APP for the State accepts notice.
3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the applicant was granted interim bail *vide* order dated 28.04.2026 passed by this Court. It is further submitted that the parties are in the process of amicably settling the matter. Accordingly, it is prayed that the interim bail



granted to the applicant *vide* order dated 28.04.2026 be extended for a further period of one week.

4. The learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2 fairly submits that the parties are making efforts to amicably settle the matter and states that he has no objection to the extension of the interim bail granted to the applicant for a further period of one week.

5. In view of the above, and considering that the parties are endeavouring to settle the matter, hat the interim bail granted to the applicant *vide* order dated 28.04.2026 is extended for a further period of one week from today, on the same terms and conditions.

6. Accordingly, the present application is disposed of.

7. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/vc



\$~12

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

+ CRL.A. 164/2026

SH. RINKU@ LAKHAN

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Dalip Kumar Santoshi and Mr.
Saurabh Kumar, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF N.C.T.OF DELHI)Respondent

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **05.05.2026**

CRL.M.(BAIL) 326/2026 (suspension of sentence)

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking suspension of sentence awarded to him *vide* impugned judgment dated 24.12.2024 and order on sentence dated 10.02.2025, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 190/2015, registered at Police Station Anand Vihar, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 392/397/411/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*'), wherein the applicant has been convicted for the offence punishable under Section 397 of the IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 07 years and to pay fine of Rs. 30,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 06



months, and also to pay fine of Rs. 2,000/- for the offence punishable under Section 411 of the IPC, and in default of payment, to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 15 days.

2. Nominal roll has been received.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant states that the applicant herein has been facing trial for 11 years and is about 42 years of age, and has remained in judicial custody for 01 years and 06 months. He further states that his conduct during the period of incarceration has been satisfactory and there is no case pending against him. It is stated that the sentence of co-accused already been suspended *vide* order dated 10.02.2025. Therefore, the sentence awarded to the appellant/applicant in the present case be suspended during the pendency of the present appeal.

4. The learned APP for the State opposes the present application and argues that case against the applicant is serious in nature. He, however, does not dispute that jail conduct of the applicant has been satisfactory.

5. In light of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the present application is allowed. It is directed that the sentence awarded to the appellant/applicant shall remain suspended during the pendency of the present appeal, subject to his furnishing a personal bond to the tune of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount, subject to satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms and conditions, subject to verification that the amount of fine be deposited with the learned Trial Court by the appellant:

- i) The appellant/applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court.
- ii) In case of change of residential address/contact details and



phone number, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Trial Court.

6. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

CRL.A. 164/2026

7. Admit.

8. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.

9. List in due course.

10. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/vc



\$~7

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 986/2026**

KULDEEP YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ranjan Kumar Bbhadani, Mr.
Mukesh Kumar Shah and Mr. Ankit
Gupta, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State with
SI Dharmender, Special Cell NR &
STF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

05.05.2026

%

1. The Director, FSL is directed to ensure that the FSL report pertaining to the voice sample of the petitioner is furnished to the Investigating Officer (IO) concerned within a period of 10 days.
2. The IO concerned is further directed to place the said FSL report on record before this Court prior to the next date of hearing.
3. List for final hearing on 08.07.2026.
4. Let the copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signature of Court Master.
5. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/vc/r



\$~86

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

+ **CRL.A. 457/2026**

MUKESH SINGH

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Suraj Prakash Sharma, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.....Respondents

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

05.05.2026

CRL.A. 457/2026

1. Admit.
2. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
3. List in due course.

CRL.M.A. 14068/2026 (exemption)

4. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
5. Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.(BAIL) 925/2026 (for suspension of sentence)

6. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking suspension of sentence awarded to him *vide* impugned judgment dated 18.04.2026 and order on sentence dated 24.04.2026, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge (NDPS Judge), North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi, in SC No. 280/2017, arising out of FIR bearing no. 06/2017, registered at Police



Station Swaroop Nagar, Delhi whereby, the applicant has been convicted for the offence punishable under Sections 307/323 of IPC and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 03 years and to pay fine of Rs. 10,000/- under Section 307 of IPC and in case of default in payment of the fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month. Further, the applicant has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of Rs. 10,000/- under Section 323 of IPC and in case of default in payment of the fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month

7. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant states that the conduct of the applicant during the period of incarceration has been satisfactory. He also states that maximum sentence awarded to the applicant is 03 years. Therefore, the sentence awarded to the appellant/applicant in the present case be suspended during the pendency of the present appeal.

8. The learned APP appearing on behalf of the State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer (IO) concerned, states that the applicant has remained in judicial custody, as under trial, for about four months.

9. Considering the fact that applicant has already remained in judicial custody for about 04 months out of 03 years awarded to him, and appeal will take time to be heard, the present application is allowed. It is directed that the sentence awarded to the appellant/applicant shall remain suspended during the pendency of the present appeal, subject to his furnishing a personal bond to the tune of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount, subject to satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms and conditions, subject to verification that the amount of fine be deposited with



the learned Trial Court by the appellant:

- i) The appellant/applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court.
 - ii) In case of change of residential address/contact details and phone number, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Trial Court.
10. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.
 11. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/zp

TD



\$~95

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1463/2026

PRATISHTHA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Harish Kohli, Advocate along
with petitioners-in-person.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for the
State with SI Parmender Kumar, P.S.
Nihal.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

05.05.2026

CRL.M.A. 14090/2026 (exemption)

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

W.P.(CRL) 1463/2026

3. By way of this writ petition, the petitioners seek issuance of direction to respondent no. 1 to provide adequate protection to the petitioners, from respondent no. 2 and their relatives in the interest of justice.
4. Issue notice. The learned ASC accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. This Court has **heard** learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned Additional Standing Counsel for State/respondent no. 1.
6. In the present case, the petitioner no. 1 and petitioner no. 2 were well



acquainted to each other and, due to their close relationship, decided to marry each other. However, the parents and relatives of petitioner no. 1 had opposed the marriage on account of caste differences. The petitioner no. 1 and petitioner no. 2 solemnized their marriage on 05.12.2025 at Arya Samaj Vivah Sthal Trust (Regd.), 1st Floor Rajinder Market, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, out of their own free will, without any force, coercion, and threat. It is stated that marriage of the petitioner was not accepted by the family of petitioner no. 1. It is further stated that there are reasonable apprehensions that respondent no. 2 and their relatives may file false cases about the kidnapping of the petitioner no. 1 against the petitioner no. 2 and may cause injury or may kill both the petitioners and family members of petitioner no. 2.

7. This Court notes that the petitioners have *inter alia* prayed for protection of their life from the respondent no. 2. The right to life and liberty is a cherished Fundamental Right guaranteed by the Constitution of India and the present case merits a careful indulgence of this Court in ensuring the same.

8. Keeping in view the sensitivity of the present matter and the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are directed to provide their contact number to the concerned SHO and Beat Constable, and the concerned officers are also directed to provide the contact numbers of Beat Constable and SHO concerned to the petitioners, and provide necessary assistance as per law in case the need so arises.

9. In view of the above, the learned counsel for the petitioners state that he is satisfied with the above arrangement.

10. It is clarified that this order will not be considered as any reflection on



the merit of any dispute, pending between the parties.

11. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.
12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/zp/gj



\$~16

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

+ **CRL.REV.P. 64/2026**

DHARAM NATH MEHTO

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sameer Chatrath, Advocate
(DHCLSC) with Mr. Arvind,
Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONRespondent

Through: Ms. Rajni Gupta, SPP with Mr.
Shivender Gupta, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

05.05.2026

CRL.M.(BAIL) 173/2026 (suspension of sentence)

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks suspension of sentence during the pendency of the present revision petition, awarded to him *vide* judgment of conviction dated 01.10.2024 and order on sentence dated 24.12.2024, passed by the learned ACJM-2-cum-ACJ, Rouse Avenue District Court, New Delhi in case arising out of FIR bearing no. RC-DAI-2009-A0042, registered at Police Station ACB, Delhi, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 420/471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*'), whereby he has been convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 420/471 of IPC and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for two years and to pay fine of Rs. 500/- for each Section and in default of payment of fine, he shall undergo simple imprisonment for a



period of 15 days.

2. The learned SPP, on the other hand opposes the present application. It is argued that the applicant herein has undergone 14 months of incarceration does not entitle him to suspend his sentence, considering the gravity of the offence. Therefore, it is prayed that the application for suspension of sentence be dismissed.

3. Issue notice. The learned SPP accepts notice on behalf of the CBI.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant states that the applicant herein has undergone sentence of 14 months out of two years. He further states that his conduct during the period of incarceration has been satisfactory and there is no case pending against him. Therefore, the sentence awarded to the appellant/applicant in the present case be suspended during the pendency of the present appeal.

5. In light of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and considering the fact that the applicant has undergone sentence of 14 months out of two years, the present application is allowed. Accordingly, it is directed that the sentence of the applicant shall remain suspended during the pendency of the present petition, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- 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.
- ii) In case of change of residential address/contact details and phone number, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court.



6. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

CRL.REV.P. 64/2026

7. Admit.

8. Reply has been filed by the CBI.

9. Written submissions have been filed by the revisionist.

10. Written submissions have not been filed by the CBI. Let the same be filed, at least two days prior to the next date of hearing.

11. List in due course.

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/vc/r



\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 387/2026**

RAJA @ SALAUDDIN @ RAJA BACCHAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar, Mr. Jitendra
Kumar Singh, Ms. Pooja and Mr.
Rahul Raghav, Advocates

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent

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

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER
05.05.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No. 277/2025, registered at Police Station Kalindi Kunj, Delhi, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 392/397 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959.

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 09.06.2022, the complainant, Mahesh Chand, made a statement alleging that on 08.06.2022 at about 11:15 PM, while he was reconciling accounts at his shop along with his employee, Hakimuddin, three unknown persons entered the premises. One of them, wearing a blue T-shirt, showed a pistol and demanded money. Another person, wearing a white shirt, caught hold of the complainant, while the person in the blue T-shirt slapped him and took the day's collection



amounting to ₹25,000/-. Thereafter, the assailants pulled down the shutter and fled from the spot.

3. During the course of the investigation, based on secret information, the applicant/accused, Raja @ Salauddin @ Raja Baccha, was arrested. A country-made pistol along with one live cartridge was recovered from his possession, and the motorcycle allegedly used in the commission of the offence, as well as ₹2,000/- were recovered at his instance. Upon completion of the investigation, charge sheet under Sections 392/397 of IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act was filed. Subsequently, charges under Sections 452/392/ 397 of IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act were framed against the accused.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that the applicant has been in judicial custody for more than eight months and that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. It is further contended that during the Test Identification Parade (TIP), the complainant failed to identify the applicant. It is also argued that the eye-witness/complainant, Mahesh Chand, has turned hostile and has stated before the learned Trial Court that he is unable to say whether the applicant was present at the time of the alleged incident. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, it is prayed that the applicant be granted bail.

5. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the State submits that the offence is serious in nature and that the applicant is a habitual offender, having been previously involved in several other cases. It is further contended that the applicant failed to appear before the concerned Court on several dates of hearing, pursuant to which non-bailable warrants were issued against him, and he was subsequently arrested. It is apprehended that if released on bail,



the applicant may evade the process of law. Accordingly, it is prayed that the applicant be not enlarged on bail.

6. 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 gone through the material available on record.

7. This Court notes that although a Test Identification Parade (TIP) of the applicant was conducted, however, the complainant/eye-witness failed to identify the applicant. Further, it is also pertinent to note that the complainant/eye-witness has not supported the prosecution case during his examination before the learned Trial Court and has stated that he is unable to say whether the applicant was present at the time of the alleged incident.

8. It is also noted that the applicant has been in judicial custody for a period exceeding eight months, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude.

9. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, particularly that the complainant/eye-witness has not identified the applicant and has turned hostile, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹10,000/- 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.
10. Accordingly, the present bail application stands allowed and is disposed of.
11. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MAY 05, 2026/ns
rb