



\$~6

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3968/2025**

SATNARAYAN

...Applicant

Through: Mr. Ravi Chawla, Mr. Ritwik Chawla and Mr. Daksh Tikoo, Advocates.

Versus

STATE THROUGH SHO P.S. BINDAPUR GOVT. OF NCT DELHI

...Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for the State with Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh, Advocate with Inspector Manoj Bhaskar, PS-Binda Pur. Mr. Sarthak Karol, Standing Counsel, DHCLSC with Ms. Neelakshi Bhadauria and Mr. Shashank Sharma, Advocates for the complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

08.04.2026

%

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in proceedings arising out of FIR No.168/2019 dated 01.03.2019 registered at PS: Bindapur under *Sections 302/120B/34* of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**) and *Sections 25/27/54/59* of the Arms Act, 1959 (**AA**).
2. A reading of the FIR discloses that the complainant along with his



relative/ the deceased, who are both vegetable cart vendors in the weekly market of Uttam Nagar, New Delhi, were in the market on 01.03.2019 when two men, one of whom had a prior animosity with the deceased and the other was his accomplice/ applicant herein initiated a conversation with the deceased, which turned into an argument/ scuffle wherein the said two men started attacking the deceased, the applicant hitting him with a rod. Eventually, when the deceased began to escape, the applicant caught him and threw him on the ground, and after physical blows, the two men shot him in his chest, hand and leg and escaped. The deceased was then taken to the DDU Hospital, where he later passed away. The chargesheet was filed against several accused persons including the applicant, who was then also arrested on 11.04.2021. The charges have since been framed *vide* order dated 06.09.2025 by the learned Trial Court.

3. In these facts, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is a law abiding citizen with clean antecedents who is being falsely implicated in the present case. He also submits that since the chargesheet as well as the supplementary chargesheet have since been filed, there is no need for further custody of the applicant. He lastly submits that since the applicant has been in judicial custody since nearly past *five years* and the trial is likely to take a substantial amount of time as the prosecution has a long list of witnesses, the applicant ought to be released on bail, particularly since many of the other co-accused persons have also been granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned APP submits that the offence is grave in nature involving murder with a firearm, and the role of the applicant therein as ascertained by recording statements of eye-witnesses and the co-accused



present during the commission of the offence, as well as by analysing the CCTV footage, is a central one, since not only did he catch hold of the deceased and pinned him to the ground when he was trying to escape, but as per the disclosure statement of the co-accused, he also provided the pistol which was used to fatally shoot the deceased, as well as disposed of the said pistol in the *Ganda Nala* later. He further submits that the applicant was, in fact, absconding after the commission of the offence and was declared a Proclaimed Offender by the learned Trial Court on 27.06.2019, and could be traced only about *two years* later. The same, as per him, suggests that there is every likelihood of the applicant absconding and committing further offences and/ or engaging in evidence tampering if released on bail, which would be gravely detrimental to the trial, since the eye-witnesses are still remaining to be examined.

5. Mr. Sarthak Karol, learned Standing Counsel for the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee appearing on behalf of the deceased/ complainant has handed over a copy of the written synopsis, which is taken on record, and submitted along the same lines as learned APP for State above.

6. Heard.

7. Taking a cumulative view of the relevant considerations, especially the role attributed to the applicant in the commission of the heinous offence involved, and especially taking into account the conduct of the applicant as he was declared a Proclaimed Offender and was absconding for nearly *two years* before he was taken into custody, there is no occasion for granting bail to the applicant under which circumstances, this Court is also of the view that there is also a likelihood of him misusing his liberty



to evade the process of law and engage in intimidation of witness and/ or tampering of evidence, especially when the trial is at a nascent stage and the eye-witnesses are yet to be examined.

8. Accordingly, since the applicant has not been able to make out a case for grant of regular bail at this stage the present application is dismissed.

9. Needless to say, the expression of opinion herein, if any, will have no bearing on the overall merits/ trial involved later.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

APRIL 8, 2026/NA