



\$~13

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4961/2025**

ROHIT RAJ @ GOLU @RANDAPetitioner

Through: **Mr. Chirag Khurana, Adv.**

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: **Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
the State**

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

10.02.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 20/2023, registered at Police Station Mandir Marg, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 394/397/75 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*').

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 21.01.2023, an information was received at PS Mandir Marg through a PCR call *vide* GD No. 64A to the effect that a person, who was allegedly showing a knife to the victim, had been caught red-handed. Upon receipt of the said information, police officials had reached the spot. At the spot, the victim-complainant Harsh Yadav, along with his wife Nikita Yadav, was present. The complainant disclosed that while he and his wife were travelling in their car, the tyre of the car had got punctured. He had thereafter stopped the car near Mandir Marg I-Point, Panchkuian Road, near the red light, and had started changing the tyre. It was further alleged that during that time, an unknown person had



approached them and had shown a knife with the intention to rob them. The said person had demanded their valuables and, in the course thereof, had scuffled with the complainant. The complainant had raised an alarm, and upon hearing the same, police personnel deployed for traffic duty nearby had rushed to the spot and had apprehended the accused red-handed along with the knife. On the statement of the complainant, the present FIR came to be registered. The knife in question was seized from the spot. During the course of investigation, statements of the eyewitnesses had been recorded and, upon completion of the investigation, charge-sheet for offence under Sections 394/397/75 of the IPC had been filed before the Court.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant/accused argues that the applicant has been in judicial custody for about three years and the trial will take some time to conclude. It is contended that prior involvement of the applicant in similar cases cannot be a sole ground to deny him bail in the present case. It is also argued that material witnesses have already been examined, and that the basic ingredients of robbery are not made out, if the case of prosecution is read in entirety. Thus, it is prayed that the applicant be granted regular bail.

4. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that allegations against the applicant are serious in nature, and he is the Bad Character (BC) of the P.S. Paharganj. It is further stated that he has been intimidating the public persons in the present case, and is involved in several cases of similar nature, and has also been convicted in one such case. It is argued that the maximum punishment for offence under Section 394 of IPC is imprisonment for life. It is thus prayed that the bail application be dismissed.



5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel appearing for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State, and has perused the material on record.
6. In the present case, this Court, having gone through the case file, is of the considered opinion that all the material prosecution witnesses, including the complainant and his wife, as well as the traffic police constable who was present at the spot, have supported the prosecution case on all material aspects during their examination before the learned Trial Court. It is noteworthy that the present accused was not only duly identified in Court, but had also been apprehended at the spot itself by the traffic police personnel.
7. The record further reveals that the complainant had sustained injuries at the hands of the applicant herein while the offence of robbery was being attempted. The applicant stands convicted in a case arising out of FIR No. 55/2018, for offences under Sections 457/380 of IPC, registered at P.S. Paharganj, and is also involved in two other cases of similar nature, namely FIR No. 173/2021, under Sections 379/411 of IPC, registered at P.S. Mandir Marg, and FIR No. 113/2021, under Sections 356/411/379 of IPC, registered at P.S. Daryaganj, apart from the present case.
8. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail at this stage.
9. However, the learned Trial Court is requested to expedite the recording of evidence in the present case.
10. Accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.
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 10, 2026/A/TD