



\$~20

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 2368/2026 & CRL.M.As. 18466-18468/2026

SURESH@MADRI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yugansh Mittal, Advocate
(DHCLSC) with Mr. Keshav
Poonia, Advocate.

versus

STATE(GOVT OF NCT)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP for
State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

01.07.2026

1. By way of this application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 360/2023 dated 13.04.2023, lodged at Police Station Jahangir Puri, District North-West, Delhi, under Sections 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"] and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 ["Arms Act"].

2. I have heard Mr. Yugansh Mittal, learned counsel for the applicant, and Mr. Tarang Srivastava, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The applicant had earlier approached the learned Sessions Court for regular bail, which was dismissed by order dated 16.12.2025. A copy of the said order is on record as Annexure P1.

4. Before the learned Sessions Court, the prosecution had filed a status report dated 16.12.2025, which has been handed over by Mr. Srivastava, and is taken on record.



5. The prosecution case, as it appears from the material on record, is as follows:

- a. The FIR was registered on the statement of one Suraj Yadav, relating to an incident of 12.04.2023.
- b. The genesis of the matter lies in a quarrel between two ladies – Ranju Devi and Arti, who are neighbours. The quarrel led to the intervention of friends and associates from both sides. These included one Jay Singh Yadav, who is the brother of the complainant in the present case, and one Mahesh.
- c. It is contended that Jay Singh Yadav and other associates went to Mahesh's residence and a violent altercation ensued, which involved the present applicant also.
- d. Both Jay Singh Yadav and the applicant were treated for injuries at Babu Jagjivan Ram Memorial Hospital, Delhi.
- e. It is alleged that the applicant thereafter retrieved a firearm from his home, returned to the hospital and opened fire on the complainant, who was at the hospital with his brother. The shot hit the back of the complainant's head.
- f. A Medico-Legal Case was registered in respect of this incident, which showed that the complainant suffered a superficial laceration in the occipital region.
- g. Two cartridges were recovered, of which one was a live cartridge and one was an empty cartridge.
- h. The FIR was thereafter registered under Sections 307 and 34 of the IPC, and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
- i. The applicant was declared as a proclaimed offender by the Court



of the Metropolitan Magistrate *vide* order dated 02.01.2024.

j. The applicant was subsequently arrested on 15.04.2024, and has been in custody since then.

6. In support of the present application, Mr. Mittal submits that the applicant has been in custody for a period of over two years, and the matter is still pending at the stage of framing of charges. He further submits that the pistol that was allegedly used in the incident has not been recovered at all.

7. Mr. Srivastava, on the other hand, submits that the proceedings concern a grave and serious offence of attempt to murder, in which the applicant is accused of having fired the shot, which caused the head injury to the complainant. He submits that there are three eye-witnesses, including the complainant, whose evidence is yet to be recorded. It is also pointed out that the applicant has as many as 14 other criminal involvements, as disclosed in the application itself. Further, having regard to the fact that the applicant was also declared as a proclaimed offender, Mr. Srivastava submits that the applicant is a flight risk, and that he is a potential threat to the complainant and other eye-witnesses.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that this is not a fit case for grant of regular bail at this stage. The charges against the applicant are serious, and include the offence under Section 307 of the IPC. The specific allegation is that the applicant fired with a pistol, which caused a head injury to the complainant. The matter remains at the stage of framing of charges. The evidence of three eye-witnesses cited by the prosecution, has not yet been recorded.

9. While prior criminal involvements are not, in all cases,



determinative of an application for bail, the number of involvements in the present case [14 other criminal involvements] is substantial. Although Mr. Mittal points out that the applicant was acquitted in five of those cases, he was also convicted in two of them – one under Section 302 of the IPC [FIR No. 382/2016, registered at Police Station Jahangir Puri], and the other under Sections 379/411 of the IPC [FIR No. 4694/2024, registered at Police Station Wazirabad]. The proceedings in respect of the remaining FIRs, which also include four offences under Section 25 of the Arms Act, and two offences under Section 307 of the IPC, remain pending. The number and nature of the other criminal involvements of the applicant also, in my view, make it inappropriate to release him on bail at this stage.

10. In view of the above, the bail application, alongwith pending applications, is dismissed.

11. However, the learned Sessions Court is requested to expedite the framing of charges and recording of the evidence of eye-witnesses and other material witnesses, to the extent possible, in accordance with its own Board and the age of matters pending before it.

12. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application, and shall neither influence the trial proceedings, nor be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 1, 2026/‘pv/KA’/