



\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4258/2025**

PIYUSH SONI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. V.K. Anand, Advocate.**

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP.
SI Niraj, PS Mundka.
SI Tarun Khatri, PS Nihal Vihar.
Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Standing
Counsel (DHCLSC) alongwith
respondents in person.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **02.04.2026**

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. 82/2025 dated 18.01.2025, registered at Police Station Nihal Vihar, Outer District, New Delhi, under Sections 118(1)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ["BNS"].
2. The subject FIR was registered at the instance of one Hardik Sharma, who was then aged 17 years old ["the complainant"]. It was stated therein that, while he was returning home from school on 17.01.2025 with a friend, a person riding a scooty touched his friend, leading to an argument. The complainant and his friend were threatened,



and on the next day i.e., 18.01.2025, the complainant was attacked by 3-4 persons, and injured in the abdomen with a sharp object.

3. After registration of the FIR, the applicant was arrested on 30.01.2025. A Child in Conflict with Law [“CCL”] was also apprehended, and is presently on bail.

4. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed under Sections 109(1)/3(5) of the BNS, read with Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

5. Without getting into the merits of the matter, Mr. V.K. Anand, learned counsel for the applicant, submits that the proceedings were listed for prosecution evidence before the learned Sessions Court yesterday i.e., 01.04.2026, when the families of the applicant and the complainant were both present. Mr. Anand states that both the complainant and a second alleged victim, Aryan Mishra, have agreed to settle the matter with the present applicant and the co-accused CCL. The complainant was also accompanied by his older brother.

6. Although no settlement agreement has yet been signed, both the victims, Hardik Sharma and Aryan Mishra, are present in Court. Copies of their Aadhaar Card are taken on record, from which it appears that they have both attained majority. At my request, Mr. Neeraj Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee, has also interacted with them and submits that they have affirmed the settlement, and do not wish to proceed further with the criminal proceedings. I have also interacted with the two victims, who have affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement.

7. Mr. Anand submits that both the victims and the accused are young



persons of approximately the same age. While the victims were both 17 years old at the time of incident, the CCL was 16 years old, and the applicant was 18 years old. He has also drawn my attention to the Medico-Legal Certificate of both victims, which record simple injuries.

8. Mr. Anand states that the applicant will move independently for quashing of the proceedings. However, at this stage, he submits that, in view of the aforesaid circumstances, the applicant may be released on bail, as he has been in custody for over one year and two months.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, and having regard to the age of the applicant, the fact that the injuries suffered by the victims were simple [although the complainant was allegedly attacked with a sharp object], and that the parties appear to have settled the matter, I am of the view that the applicant may be released on bail at this stage.

10. It is, therefore, directed that the applicant be released on bail in connection with FIR No. 82/2025 dated 18.01.2025, registered at Police Station Nihal Vihar, Outer District, New Delhi, subject to furnishing of a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/-, with one surety in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Metropolitan Magistrate, and subject to the following further conditions:

- a. The applicant shall appear before the concerned Trial Court on each and every date of hearing fixed.
- b. The applicant shall ordinarily reside at the address as per prison records, and shall not change the address without prior intimation to the concerned Investigating Officer ["IO"]/ Station House Officer ["SHO"].



- c. The applicant shall furnish his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO, and shall ensure that the said mobile number remains operational and switched on at all times. The mobile number shall not be changed, nor shall the phone be switched off, without prior intimation to the IO/SHO.
 - d. The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, offer any threat to the complainants/victims, any of the prosecution witnesses, or other persons acquainted with the facts of the case.
 - e. The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, tamper with evidence nor otherwise indulge in any act or omission that would prejudice the proceedings in the pending trial.
 - f. The applicant shall not commit any offence during the pendency of the proceedings.
11. The bail application is disposed of in terms of the above.
12. It is clarified that the observations made herein are solely for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application, and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case, nor shall they prejudice the rights and contentions of the parties at any stage of the proceedings.
13. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information and necessary compliance.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 2, 2026
'pv/KA'/