

SC No. 72/2006
State Vs Nakul
FIR No. 318/2025
PS Karawal Nagar

21.05.2026

Present: Sh. Abhishek Pandey, Ld. Addl.PP for the State.
Sh. R.K.Santoshi & Sh Amrit Anand, Ld. Counsels
for applicant/accused Aakash Panchal.
Ms Alka Singh, Sh. Vaibhav Tomar, Sh. Vishal &
Sh. Nandan, Ld. Counsels for complainant.
IO ASI Yashveer Singh in person.

1. I have heard arguments on the bail application filed on behalf of applicant/accused Aakash Panchal.
2. It is submitted by Ld. counsel for applicant/accused Aakash Panchal that he is not visible in CCTV footage of 16.10.2025. There is no CDR to show his presence at the spot. According to the prosecution case, Sonu with one other person come out from the car, fired at the complainant and applicant/accused Aakash Panchal is not one of them. Further, there is no recovery of any weapon from the applicant/accused Aakash Panchal. Further, only one case is pending against him and not four cases as stated by the prosecution.
3. It is submitted by Ld. Addl PP for the state duly assisted by the IO that fourth accused in this case namely Sonu has been arrested yesterday. It is submitted by Ld. Add. PP that video footage in this case was played at the time of hearing of bail application of accused Nakul on 08.05.2026. It is submitted that it is mentioned in the order sheet dated 08.05.2026 that the face of applicant/accused Aakash Panchal is clear in the CCTV footage of 15.10.2025 and CCTV footage at petrol pump on

16.10.2025 at 07:09am. The incident occurred at 08:20am on 16.10.2025. It is submitted that applicant/accused Aakash Panchal was seen in the car before the incident which shows his involvement in the offence.

4. It is submitted by the IO that these persons took the car on rent on 15.10.2025 but could not commit the offence on that day. On 16.10.2025 they could be seen waiting and doing recon of the area alongwith other persons. It is submitted that there were some monetary disputes between complainant and applicant/accused Aakash Panchal. That applicant/accused Aakash Panchal had hired professional people to commit the offence. He had motive to commit this offence and is the main conspirator in the present case.

5. It is submitted that the car which was hired by the accused persons had GPS installed in it and as per location of GPS the car was present at the spot at the time of offence. Its location is of the spot.

6. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for complainant submits that as firing started on complainant, he covered his face with arms due to which he received five bullet injuries on his arms. If he would not have covered his face with arms, the bullets would have hit on his face. Further, there is bullet injuries in abdomen also and his treatment is still going on. It is submitted that despite the bullets being fired at him, he managed to back the car in order to save himself yet bullets were fired from the back also. He survived only because he managed to run away. It is submitted that only because some monetary dispute were between them, the applicant/accused Aakash Panchal hired

a professional killers to kill the complainant.

7. I have heard both the sides and gone through the record.

8. The incident was witnessed by one Lady police Constable who had given number of the Grey Punch Car to the IO. The incident happened on 16.10.2025 at 08.20am and FIR was registered in the afternoon at 03:42pm and number of Grey colour Punch Car is mentioned in the same.

9. The complainant specifically deposed about the prior enmity between him and applicant/accused Aakash Panchal which imputes a motive on the part of the applicant/accused Aakash Panchal to commit the offence. IO had played the CCTV footage before this court on 08.05.2026.

10. IO had played a video footage in Court dt. 15.10.2025 wherein at 06.59 am, accused Akash Panchal and Nakul were seen getting down from TSR, Akash was wearing red cap and Nakul was wearing white shirt. Face of Akash was very clear and face of Nakul was also very clear. There were two different videos capturing this incident. Then Akash waived his hand towards a gray / black colour car and then they moved towards it after crossing the road.

11. IO had played another CCTV footage from a petrol pump dt. 16.10.2025 wherein at 07.09 am, a gray Punch car stopped at the petrol pump and accused Akash Panchal came out from the car, he was wearing red cap. His face was very very clear, he could be seen using his mobile.

12. Then IO played another video footage dt. 16.10.2025 from NH709B Loni Ghaziabad Road where at 07.02

am, a TATA Punch Car was visible, whose number was also visible i.e. 0130 wherein two persons are sitting at the front, but their faces are not Visible.

13. IO had played another CCTV footage in Court dt. 16.10.2025 wherein at 08.12 am, a TATA Punch Car whose number is very clear i.e. DL14CH0130 is waiting towards the side of wide gali / pulia wherein two persons could be seen sitting at the front but their faces are not clear, then it moves out of the gali.

14. Then IO played another CCTV footage dt. 16.10.2025 where at 08.00 am, TATA Punch Car bearing no. DL14CH0130 could be seen passing through a wide gali adjacent to nala, in the car two persons were visible sitting at the front and one person was visible sitting at the back, but faces of any of the persons was not clear.

15. Perusal of CCTV footage would show that applicant/accused Aakash Panchal is visible in the CCTV footage on 15.10.2025, when he took this Punch car on rent. He is also visible in the CCTV footage on 16.10.2025 at 07:09am on the Petrol Pump. The car is visible around the spot waiting for the complainant. It was applicant/accused Aakash Panchal only who had motive to commit the offence and as per the prosecution case he is the main conspirator. As per GPS of the car, the car was present at the spot at the time of offence.

16. There is sufficient material on record to show and create very strong suspicion regarding involvement of applicant/accused Aakash Panchal at this stage.

17. Let's look at the manner of commission of crime.

Professional people were hired to commit the crime. They had enough courage to stop the car of the complainant onroad during day time and come out of the car without mask and fired straight on the face of the complainant who is pursuing LLB. Such was the confidence of these shooters that they did not even thought of covering their faces and one shooter is already identified in TIP and other is stated to be arrested yesterday only. The manner of commission of crime shows that accused, who is allegedly the main conspirator, had no fear of law and order.

18. As far as bail on the ground of parity is concerned, accused Nakul was granted bail as he was not known to the complainant and he did not come out of the car as per prosecution case. His presence in this case was not established while applicant/accused Aakash Panchal who had hired the car was seen with the car on the date of incident, before the incident. Hence, the ground of parity does not apply here.

19. In overall circumstances of the case, **this court is not inclined to grant the bail to applicant/accused Aakash Panchal.**

20. Application disposed off.

21. Nothing mentioned herein shall affect merits of the case.

(Twinkle Wadhwa)
ASJ-02(NE)/KKD/Delhi
21.05.2026/k