



\$~66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 1949/2026**
SAJEBPetitioner

Through: Mr. R.K.L. Chaudhary, Advocate
versus

THE STATE GOVT.N.C.T. OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for State
SI Mukesh Kumar, PS Khyala, Delhi

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
18.05.2026

%

CRL.M.A. 15864/2026 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 1949/2026

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 532/2025 dated 24.11.2025 registered at Police Station Khyala for commission of offence under Section 118(1)/3(5) *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (corresponding Section 307/34 IPC).
2. It is a case of attempted murder and applicant herein has been specifically named by the complainant.
3. Allegations made in the FIR have been perused. Complainant Mr. Yusuf claimed that when he, along with his cousin Asad, were present at the spot, applicant Sajeb along with his friends came there and asked for his mobile phone and, thereafter, a quarrel ensued, consequent upon which, applicant Sajeb became furious and stabbed on the lower abdomen region of Asad.

BAIL APPLN. 1949/2026

1



4. Learned counsel for applicant submits that a false story has been churned out by the complainant and at the relevant time, applicant was not present at the spot and he has been falsely implicated in connivance with the Police Authorities.

5. Fact, however, remains that, at the moment, there is nothing on record which may belie the version of complainant and injured. Moreover, they have been specifically named by the complainant. As per the reply filed by the prosecution before the learned Sessions Court, the CCTV footage of the incident was preserved and when it was scrutinized, it revealed the presence of the applicant also.

6. Learned Addl. P.P. for State also submits that when, earlier, the applicant had prayed for anticipatory bail and filed an application to said effect before the learned Sessions Court, his address, which he had mentioned in the application, was got verified and the concerned occupant/owner of the premises was contacted who claimed that no one with the name of Sajeb ever lived at the said address.

7. Such conduct clearly goes on to show that the intention of the applicant is other than *bona fide*.

8. Moreover, keeping in mind the seriousness of the allegations, the custodial interrogation would be imperative, in particular, to recover the weapon of offence.

9. Viewed thus, this Court does not find any merit in the present application. Same is accordingly dismissed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 18, 2026/dr/pb