



\$~18

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 5079/2025**

BAIDUL @ BAHIDULLS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Faraz Nabi, Advocate

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP

Mr. Ayaz Ahmad, Advocate for victim

SI Rakesh Gilla

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

08.01.2026

%

1. Petitioner Baidul @ Bahidulls seeks anticipatory bail in a case where he is facing allegations of attempted murder.
2. FIR is based on information given by one Mohammad Rabiul (injured). According to him, one month prior to the incident, one lady namely Sarita sustained injuries on her head for which a case had been registered and one Monu was in jail in that case. Due to aforesaid registration of FIR, several persons were forcing them to get the matter compromised or else to face dire consequences.
3. On the date of the incident i.e. on 20.10.2025, when complainant along with his one relative was going to Zakir Nagar from his house, one Bharat and his three associates including petitioner Baidul @ Bahidulls were found standing near one tree. They all were having guns in their hands and complainant knew them beforehand. On the exhortation of accused Baidul, accused Bharat fired at complainant which resulted in gunshot injury on right



arm of complainant.

4. There are four assailants in all and accused Bharat and Azam Malik have already been arrested and are running in judicial custody.

5. As far as other two accused/assailants are concerned, including petitioner herein, they could not be arrested and it is informed that coercive process has already been issued against them by the learned Trial Court.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that it is a false case. According to him, at the relevant time, petitioner was at his house and such fact can easily be ascertained by the investigation agency with the help of CCTV of his own home. Secondly, according to him, injury in question is a self-inflicted one, created to falsely implicate the accused persons.

7. Be that as it may, quite clearly, it is a case where custodial interrogation would be imperative, particularly, when assailants were, allegedly, carrying firearms, which are yet to be recovered.

8. In view of the above, no case is made out to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Application is accordingly dismissed.

9. Needless to say, as and when accused is arrested and custodial interrogation takes place, investigating agency can always evaluate the alleged CCTV footage on which petitioner seeks to rely upon.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JANUARY 8, 2026/dr/sy