

Bail Matter No. 1153/2026
State Vs. 'VR'
FIR No. 184/2026
PS Swaroop Nagar
U/s. 309(4)/311/317(2)/333/351(3)/3(5) BNS

03.07.2026

This is an application under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail moved on behalf of applicant/ accused namely 'VR'.

Present: Dr. Sarita Rani, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. Pardeep Kadyan, Ld. Counsel for the accused / applicant.

Arguments heard.

1. Briefly stated that on 15.05.2026, the complainant Ravi Yadav was present at his brother-in-law's shop "Yadav Mobile Hub" located at H. No. 31/1, Near Shiv Mandir, Nangli Poona, Swaroop Nagar, Delhi when at around 2:00 PM, the accused Vishu along with his accomplices Chanchal and co-accused 'H' entered the shop, locked it from inside, put a knife on the complainant's neck, pointed a toy gun at his head, taped his mouth and hands with plastic tape, and robbed Rs. 30,000/- from the shop cash drawer along with 3 earbuds. The accused persons were apprehended by the public after a hue and cry was raised by the complainant. From the possession of the applicant/accused Vishu, a knife and Rs. 10,000/- (being part of the robbed amount) were recovered.

It has been further stated that on interrogation, accused Vishu S/o Bijender and Chanchal S/o Vijay Kumar

disclosed that the applicant 'VR' is an active participant in the commission of the offence. As per the disclosure statement of co-accused Chanchal, all three accused persons, namely Chanchal, Vishu, and the applicant 'VR', had jointly hatched a conspiracy to rob small money transfer shopkeepers, and pursuant to the said plan, on 15.05.2026 at approximately 1:30 PM, Chanchal, Vishu and the applicant 'VR' came to Kadipur Road, Swaroop Nagar, Delhi, in auto bearing No. DL IRAB 1038. It has been specifically disclosed that the applicant 'VR' went ahead to conduct a recce of the targeted money transfer shop and reported back to the co-accused that only one boy aged 18-19 years was present inside the shop. Thereafter, all three accused entered the shop together, after which the applicant 'VR' and Vishu looted the cash from the cash drawer of the shop and also applicant 'VR' lifted three earbuds from the shop, and the applicant 'VR' retained the looted amount Rs. 20,000 and successfully fled from the spot before he could be apprehended.

2. It was argued by the Ld. Counsel for the accused / applicant that the applicant/petitioner has no concern with the above said alleged offences, but, the police officials of P.S. Swaroop Nagar registered false and fabricated case against the applicant/petitioner. It was argued further that the police official has regularly visited the house of the applicant/petitioner, hence, there is an apprehension in the mind of the applicant/petitioner that he may be arrested in the above said false and fabricated case. Hence, prayer is made to allow the present application.

3. Ld. Additional PP for the State duly vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application submitting that the allegations levelled against the applicant/ accused are very grave and serious in nature. Prayer for dismissal of the application was made.

4. As per report filed by the IO, it has been stated therein that the recovery of robbed Rs. 20,000/- and 3 earbuds are yet to be recovered from the applicant 'VR' and TIP proceedings of 'VR' are yet to be conducted as complainant stated in his statement that he can identify the alleged persons and the applicant 'VR' is clearly visible in CCTV Footage conducting reconnaissance of the complainant's shop, and then entering the shop and fleeing from the place of incident. It has been further stated therein that during the raid at the address of the applicant, his family members produced his birth certificate and school certificate, in which, it was found that the DOB of applicant is 09.04.2009.

5. I have heard Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused and Ld. Addl. PP for the State as well as perused the report filed by the IO.

6. Although, there is no provision for grant of anticipatory bail to CCL in Juvenile Justice Act, however, a CCL cannot be left remedyless. My opinion in this regard is fortified by the opinion expressed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in case titled as **Jatin Vs. State of Punjab Neutral**

citation no.2024:PHHC:050945, CRM-M-4670-2024 & CRM-M-16973-2024.

In view of the same, the application for anticipatory bail of applicant is hereby dismissed. However, interim protection is granted to applicant with directions to him to appear before concerned JJB on **07.07.2026** for the purpose of compliance of provisions of section 12 of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. In the meantime, IO is directed not to detain the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail stands dismissed and disposed of.

8. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(VANDANA)
Addl. Sessions Judge-02(North)
Rohini Courts Delhi
03.07.2026