



\$~81

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1780/2026**

CHIRAG BANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Naagar, Mr. Manohar
Naagar, Advocates

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

07.05.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 270/2025, registered at Police Station Shahdara, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 109(1)/249(B)/61(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act.

2. Brief facts of the case, as emerging from the statement of the complainant Rhythm Soorma, are that on the intervening night of 14/15.08.2025 at about 12:50 AM, the complainant had received a phone call from his friend Akhil Panwar (the injured), who informed him that accused Chirag was abusing him and asked him to come to Naveen Bakery, Tikona Park, Shahdara. Upon receiving the call, the complainant also called his friend Krishan Jatav and both of them reached the spot within 5–10 minutes, where the injured and Dr. Kamal were already present. It is further



alleged that while the complainant and Dr. Kamal were persuading the injured to return home, owing to the late hour. After some time, the co-accused Gaurav Nagar, along with his brother, Saurabh Nagar, arrived at the spot. Thereafter, an altercation ensued between co-accused Gaurav Nagar and the injured, during which co-accused Gaurav Nagar had allegedly stated that the injured had been abusing them and that Chirag (the present applicant) had informed them about the same. The quarrel allegedly intensified despite efforts made by the complainant and Dr. Kamal to pacify both sides, and, thereafter, both Gaurav Nagar and Saurav Nagar fired gunshots at the injured with their respective pistols with the intention to kill him, and thereafter fled from the spot.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the applicant has remained in judicial custody since 19.08.2025 and that charges are yet to be framed by the learned Trial Court. It is further submitted that the prosecution has cited as many as 50 witnesses in the charge sheet and, considering that the stage of framing of charge is yet to be reached, the trial is likely to take a considerable period of time to conclude. It is further contended that the applicant was not present at the spot at the relevant time and that no recovery has been effected from the present applicant. Accordingly, it is prayed that the present application be allowed and the applicant be enlarged on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State opposes the present application and submits that the allegations against the applicant are grave and serious. It is contended that the applicant has emerged as a conspirator and facilitator in the commission of the alleged offence. It is further submitted that even in



the FIR, the complainant has specifically stated that co-accused Gaurav Nagar had informed the injured that the applicant had told him that the injured was abusing them, which ultimately led to the altercation and the subsequent incident. It is further argued that the injured sustained three gunshot injuries on vital parts of his body. It is also submitted that, in the event the applicant is released on bail, there exists a reasonable apprehension that he may influence or intimidate the prosecution witnesses. Accordingly, it is prayed that the applicant be not enlarged on bail.

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

6. This Court notes that the applicant has remained in judicial custody since 19.08.2025. It is further noted that charges are yet to be framed. The prosecution has cited as many as 50 witnesses; therefore, considering the stage of the proceedings, the trial is likely to take a considerable period of time to conclude.

7. Further, it is pertinent to note that the chargesheet has already been filed and the investigation in the present case stands concluded *qua* the applicant; therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant in judicial custody. He has already remained in custody for about 10 months.

8. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the charges have not been framed yet and the accused is in judicial custody since 19.08.2025, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant herein, on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.15,000/- 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.

9. Accordingly, the present bail application stands allowed and is disposed of.

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

11. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

**MAY 07, 2026/zp
RB**