

3 BAIL MATTERS 505/2026
THE STATE Vs. VIPIN ALIAS PAPPAN
FIR No. 117/2026
(Seelam Pur)

08.07.2026

Present: Dr. Satish Shukla, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Sachin Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for applicant.
Deputed IO SI Shivam Sharma in person.
IO SI Sudhanshu in person.
Inspector Narpal Singh, SHO PS Seelampur.

This is an anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of accused Vipin @ Pappan.

On 04.06.2026, directions were issued to the accused to join the investigation of the case pursuant to proper service of notice by the IO. Thereafter, the matter was adjourned for final disposal of the application on 03.07.2026. On 03.07.2026, the Court was on leave. Accordingly, the matter was adjourned for 07.07.2026 i.e. yesterday. However, owing to the absence of SHO PS Seelampur for necessary clarifications, the application was adjourned for today.

Today SHO PS Seelampur is present in the court alongwith both the main IO as well as deputed IO.

It is relevant to note here that the present FIR case was registered on the complaint of the complainant Pratham Bansal for the commission of offence u/s 310 (2)/61(2)/62/140(A)/3 BNSS, as it is alleged that on 23.03.2026 at about 08:30 PM when the complainant alongwith his father Anesh Bansal was returning on his scooty from their jewelry shop at Chandni Chowk and had reached near DCP Office, GT Road, ahead of Welcome Metro Station, two unknown accused intercepted them on their scooty from behind and caused them to fall by

hitting their scooty in the scooty of the complainant. It is alleged that immediately thereafter, one Scorpio Car in which two more unknown persons were present also reached at the spot and thereafter, all of them attacked the complainant and his father and also robbed the complainant of his gold chain weighing around 19 gms and one gold brick weighing around 1 kg. Further they also tried to abduct the complainant and his father in the car. However, the complainant and his father somehow managed to save themselves from the said persons. Thereafter, the accused persons ran away from the spot and also took away the scooty of the complainant. Further, they also took away one sky blue colour bag of the complainant which was containing around Rs. 30-40,000/- cash.

During the course of investigation, some of the accused namely Rahul Kumar, Bhola Pandit, Arjun @ Sumit Gupta, Arun @ Manish and Mohit @ Ammo were arrested by the police and in his disclosure statement accused Arjun @ Sumit Gupta, Arun @ Manish, Mohit @ Ammo and Sumit also disclosed about the involvement of the present accused.

Yesterday a fresh reply was also filed by the IO with respect to the compliance of the directions of the court to the accused to join the investigation of the case. As per the reply, in compliance of the directions of the court, the accused duly joined the investigation and appeared before the IO in muffled face on 02.07.2026 and thereafter, for the purpose of his identification he was also shown to the complainant of the present case who is presently stated to be in Dubai through whatsapp video call. It is further stated in the reply that as of now no further custodial interrogation is required, however, his judicial TIP is pending.

It is relevant to mention here that as apparent from the

police case file, the only incriminating material available against the applicant/accused was the disclosure statement of his co-accused and as such judicial TIP of the accused was very essential in order to establish his identity as one of the alleged offender before conducting any other exercise at his instance. Admittedly, as per the on reply of the IO, there has also been no recovery of any case property at the instance of the applicant/accused and his other co-accused Sameer Khan and as such it was only the judicial TIP of the accused which could have established his identity as one of the offender and link him with the incident in question.

However, as apparent from the reply of the IO, the IO has chosen to follow a practice which is completely unknown under the criminal law to ascertain the identity of applicant/accused by showing him to the complainant through a video call. The Court also fails to understand as to why the IO did not produce the accused before the Ld. Judicial Magistrate for obtaining his consent for the judicial TIP and moved an appropriate application for the conduct of his judicial TIP though, in the order dated 04.06.2026 it was one of the main contention of the IO for opposing the grant of anticipatory bail.

Further, if the complainant of the case for any reason was not available for the purpose of judicial TIP of the accused, since the very perusal of the police complaint of the complainant itself reveals that the father of the complainant was also an eye witness to the incident, the IO could have easily asked him to participate in the TIP proceedings and as such there was no reason for him to straight away show the accused to the complainant in order to ascertain his identity. However, the IO has given a complete go by to the set standard procedure for establishing the

identity of the accused of an offence. On the contrary, the very conduct of the IO has created a serious dent in the police investigation and the case of the complainant. Further, it is also very strange that despite himself mentioning that the complainant refused to recognize the application/accused and his co-accused Sameer Khan as the quality of the video call was not clear, at the same time, IO has also mentioned in his reply that further custodial interrogation of the accused is not required for any purpose.

The manner in which the IO has acted in the conduct of the investigation and has completely failed to follow the set standard procedure of investigation, the same itself speaks of the inexperience as well as inefficiency on his part in conducting fair and proper investigation of the case.

At this stage, the Ld. ADDL PP for the State has stated that though IO of the case has not acted in a proper manner during the conduct of the investigation of the case, however the inefficiency and failure of the IO to follow the set standard procedure, cannot be allowed to hamper the case of the complainant. It is further stated that though the IO of the case should not have shown the applicant/accused to the complainant on a mobile phone call, however, it is also stated that since the father of the complainant can also identify the applicant/accused, the application may be adjourned for one more hearing so that in the meantime judicial TIP of the accused can be conducted through the father of the complainant.

Submissions are heard.

Though, in view of the fact that the applicant/accused has already been shown to the complainant on a mobile phone call by the IO

and therefore, the judicial TIP of the accused at the instance of complainant would be of no value, however since the identity of the accused as one of the offender can be still established through his judicial TIP by the father of the complainant, the court is also of the opinion that it would be more appropriate if the application is finally disposed off only after the conduct of the judicial TIP of the accused at the instance of the father of the complainant.

Accordingly, the application now stands adjourned for final hearing on 20.07.2026.

SHO PS Seelampur, who is present in the court is accordingly, directed to immediately remove both the main as well as deputed IO from the investigation of the case and to assign the case for further investigation to some other IO.

Let a fresh reply be submitted by SHO/IO of the case on NDOH.

(BALWINDER SINGH)
ASJ (FTC)/North-
East/KKD Courts/
Delhi/08.07.2026