



\$~4

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3843/2025**

AJAY @ VEERU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Chauhan, Adv.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

16.02.2026

CRL.M.A. 29983/2025 (exemption)

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

BAIL APPLN. 3843/2025

3. By way of this application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 591/2024, registered at Police Station Mahender Park, Delhi, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109(1)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959.
4. Briefly stated, facts of the present case are that on 17.11.2024, an MLC intimation *vide* DD No. 3A was received regarding gunshot injuries to victim Soaib. On reaching BJRM Hospital, Delhi the victim was found under treatment for firearm injury. It is stated that the victim was informed that he was fired upon on 16.11.2024 at about 11.50 PM near I-Block, 1200



waligali, by known persons. The police officials found two KF 7.65 empty cartridges at the spot along with a stolen Honda Activa Scooty bearing No. DL-8SCT-6940. The eyewitness Shahwaz had given a detailed account stating that the accused Anuj and the present applicant/accused, both armed with pistols, had intentionally attempted to murder the victim at the instance of accused Vishal @ Kala, who had long-standing enmity with the victim due to a previous FIR under Section 307 of the IPC lodged against him. During the course of investigation, both accused Ajay @ Veeru and Anuj were apprehended on 17.11.2024.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the present accused/applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case, and has been in judicial custody for more than one year and three months. It is contended that no *prima-facie* case is made out against the applicant, as there is no iota of evidence to suggest that the applicant has committed the alleged offence. It is also argued that the co-accused Anuj, with similar role, has been granted bail by the learned Trial Court *vide* order dated 30.05.2025. Therefore, it is prayed that accused/applicant be also granted regular bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the present application and argues that allegations against the accused are grave and serious in nature, and if released, the applicant herein may extend threats to the prosecution witnesses. It is further stated that the present applicant has previous involvements. Thus, it is prayed that the present application be dismissed.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for both the parties, and has perused the material on record.

8. This Court notes that the applicant/accused has been in judicial



custody for a period exceeding one year and three months. This Court further notes that co-accused Anuj, who has similar role, has been granted bail by the learned Trial Court *vide* order dated 30.05.2025.

9. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and for the reasons recorded hereinabove, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with surety 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 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 in 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.

10. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

11. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.



12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J
FEBRUARY 16, 2026/A