



\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 5047/2025**

**AMAN BAJJAD**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sandip Gupta, Mr. Vineet  
Negi & Mr. Khwahish Khurana,  
Advocates.

versus

**STATE NCT OF DELHI**

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State.  
Insp. Praveen & Insp. Mukesh, PS  
Hari Nagar.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN**

**ORDER**

% **13.05.2026**

1. By way of the present application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with FIR No. 269/2022, dated 12.03.2022, registered under Sections 308/323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], at Police Station Hari Nagar.

2. I have heard Mr. Sandip Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor. Ms. Arya states, upon instructions from Inspector Mukesh, Investigating Officer ["IO"], that the family of the deceased have been informed of the pendency of the present matter in terms of the order dated 24.12.2025.

3. Mr. Gupta submits that several co-accused in the present case have been granted bail, including by this Court in *Ashwani Khatri v. State*



*Govt. of NCT of Delhi* [BAIL APPLN. 264/2025, decided on 25.04.2025], *Akash @ TT v. State of NCT of Delhi* [BAIL APPLN. 594/2026, decided on 07.04.2026] [hereinafter, “Akash”] and *Ankit Shokeen v. State (NCT of Delhi)* [BAIL APPLN. 645/2026, decided on 07.04.2026] [hereinafter, “Ankit Shokeen”]. He therefore seeks parity.

4. The prosecution case relates to an alleged assault on two inmates inside a jail cell by fellow prisoners, including the present petitioner. It is alleged that, as a result of the said incident, one of the victims succumbed to the injuries sustained. The incident is further stated to have been captured on CCTV.

5. Mr. Gupta submits that the case of the present petitioner, even according to the prosecution, is similar to the role of co-accused Akash @ TT and Ankit Shokeen. In the common judgement dated 07.04.2026, in the case of *Akash and Ankit Shokeen*, this Court noted as follows:

“5. Learned APP has played the CCTV footage in court. The manner in which the two groups assaulted two co-prisoners, one of whom succumbed, conveys an impression that although the assailants were waiting for the victims to enter the cell, but the manner of assault does not show a concerted attack. Practically, it was free for all with a number of inmates assaulting both the victims. Some of the assailants were carrying dandas while others were using fists and kicks.

6. In response to a specific query, the Investigating Officer admits that he did not investigate into the role played by the jail officials in order to find out as to how dandas entered the cell.

7. Further, as submitted by both sides, during trial, three of the prosecution witnesses have turned hostile to prosecution.”

6. Ms. Arya submits that the present petitioner, like co-accused Akash @ TT, assaulted the victim with fist/kicks, whereas co-accused Ankit Shokeen allegedly used a “danda”. She accepts that the petitioner’s case



is at par with Aakash.

7. As far as the previous involvements of the petitioner are concerned, the status report reveals that the petitioner is involved in three other criminal cases. However, it is clear from the judgment dated 07.04.2026 that co-accused Akash @ TT and Ankit Shokeen also had several prior involvements. In any event, the judgment of *Prabhakar Tewari v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr* [(2020) 11 SCC 648] makes it clear that prior involvements need not always lead to denial of bail to an accused.

8. Having regard to the ground of parity urged by Mr. Gupta and the submissions of Ms. Arya recorded above, the application is allowed, and it is directed that the petitioner will be released on bail in the FIR No. 269/2022, dated 12.03.2022, registered under Sections 308/323/34 of IPC, at Police Station Hari Nagar, subject to furnishing of a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, and subject to the following further conditions:

- a. The petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date of hearing;
- b. The petitioner shall provide his permanent address to the Trial Court, as also the address where he is residing during the pendency of the case. The petitioner shall intimate the IO, and file an affidavit before the Trial Court, regarding any change in residential address;
- c. The petitioner shall provide his mobile number to the concerned IO/Station House Officer, which shall be kept in working condition at all times. The mobile number shall not be switched off or



changed without prior intimation to the IO during the pendency of the trial;

- d. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;
- e. The petitioner shall not commit any offence during the period of his release.

9. The bail application is disposed of in terms of the above.

10. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are solely for the purpose of deciding the present bail application, and shall neither influence the trial proceedings, nor be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Copy of the order be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent electronically for information and necessary compliance.

**PRATEEK JALAN, J**

**MAY 13, 2026**

*'pv'/AD/*