



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 4917/2025, CRL.M.A. 37958/2025

MOHD. TASLEEM

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Shivender Kumar Sharma, Mr.
Urooj Chaudhary and Ms. Esha
Sharma, Advs.

Versus

THE STATE (GNCTD)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, APP with Mr.
Aditya Vikram Singh and Ms.
Upasana Bakshi and Ms. Divya
Bakshi, Advs. with SI- Rakesh
Gilla, PS: NFC
Mr. Ayaz Ahmed, Adv. for
complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

15.05.2026

1. By virtue of the present bail application under *Section 482* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.438/2025 dated 21.10.2025 registered under *Sections 109(1)/3(5)* of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (**BNS**) and *Sections 25/27* of the Arms Act, 1959 at PS: New Friends Colony, South-East Delhi.
2. *Briefly put*, as per the prosecution story, the present FIR came to be registered on the statement of complainant Mohd. Rabiul, who alleged that prior to the incident, he was being pressurized and threatened by the present applicant and other co-accused persons, namely, Bharat, Azam, Futti and Baidul to enter into a compromise in a case registered at Police Station New Friends Colony, involving one Monu, a friend of co-accused Bharat. As per him, accused Bharat used to act at the behest of the present



applicant and his wife Futti, who used to supply him with firearms. It was alleged that on the night of the incident, when the complainant along with his relative reached near the wooden bridge over the drain at Taimoor Nagar, accused Bharat, at the instigation of other co-accused persons, fired at him with an intention to kill him, causing an injury to his right forearm.

3. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that the weapon of offence was arranged by the applicant from co-accused Saidul Zafar.

4. In these facts, learned counsel for the applicant praying for grant of anticipatory bail submits that **[i]** the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case, as he was neither present at the spot nor had any role in the alleged incident; **[ii]** the applicant had no concern or connection with the alleged dispute between the complainant and Monu; **[iii]** the allegations against the applicant are solely based on the statement of the complainant and no independent material has surfaced during investigation connecting him with the offence; **[iv]** the complainant has lodged the present FIR out of personal vendetta inasmuch as prior to the registration thereof, the applicant had made police complaints against him; **[v]** there is an inordinate delay of nearly eighteen hours in registration of the present FIR; **[vi]** CCTV footage shows presence of the applicant at his residence at the relevant time; and lastly **[vii]** chargesheet already stands filed, without arrest of the present applicant.

5. *Per Contra*, learned APP for the State, relying upon the Status report, opposes grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant and submits that **[i]** the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature inasmuch as he along with his wife are the prime conspirators and the other co-accused persons were working at their instance; **[ii]** during investigation, it has



been revealed that the weapon of offence was arranged by the applicant; *[iii]* the applicant is also involved in four other FIRs; *[iv]* the chargesheet *qua* applicant has not been filed yet; and lastly *[v]* in view of gravity of allegations, there exists every likelihood that if bail is granted to the applicant, he may influence/ threaten the witnesses, tamper with evidence, jump the bail and may not join the trial.

6. Heard and perused the documents on record.

7. As per the facts, there are serious allegations against the applicant as a specific role is attributed to him. There is a previous history *inter se* the parties involved herein as it is alleged that the applicant along with his wife, had been pressurizing and threatening the complainant to enter into a compromise and that at their behest, co-accused Bharat had fired upon the complainant. In fact, as per the Status Report, investigation reveals that it was the applicant who had arranged the weapon of offence from another co-accused. Also, the charge sheet *qua* the applicant has not yet been filed.

8. These facts do not call for granting anticipatory bail to the applicant. More so, since he is not a first-time offender as he is implicated in four other FIRs involving offences of similar nature.

9. *Ergo*, in view of the aforesaid discussion, the present bail application is dismissed.

10. Needless to say, since the expression of opinion, if any, are for the purposes of adjudicating the present application only, they have no bearing on the overall merits/ trial involved.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

MAY 15, 2026/Ab