

IA 5/2026 in SC no. 17/2026
State Vs Raju
FIR no. 1145/2025
PS Karol Bagh

21.02.2026

This is an application u/s 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail filed on behalf of the accused Raju.

Present: Sh. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.

Sh. Ravinder Kumar and Sh. Shrawan, Ld. Counsels for the applicant/accused.

Arguments heard.

Reply filed. Taken on record. Copy be supplied.

Arguments heard.

It is submitted by Id. Counsel for the accused/ applicant that the accused/ applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and is in JC since 25.09.2025. It is further submitted that no bail application of either the accused/ applicant or of any co-accused person is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi or Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is submitted that there is nothing to connect the accused/ applicant with the offence in question. It is submitted that the previous bail application of the accused/applicant was dismissed on 10.02.2026 for the reasons that the prosecution has relied upon the CDRs of the accused/applicant for establishing his role in the offence in question. It is submitted that in view of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in special leave to appeal (Crl.) 242 of 2022 arising out of Diary no. 22702 of 2022 in case titled as State by (NCB) Bengaluru Vs. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta & Anr, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi passed in Bail Application No. 1383/2022 titled as Phundreimayum Yas Khan Vs. State of NCT of Delhi and Hon'ble High

Court of Delhi in Bail Application No. 1433/2023 titled as Ramesh Kakkar Vs. State of NCT of Delhi, the CDRs in itself are not sufficient to implicate the accused/applicant. It is submitted that no offence against the accused/applicant is made out since mere acquittance with the accused persons cannot be criteria and that accused/applicant had no knowledge about any such incident. It is submitted that the charge sheet has been filed and the accused/ applicant is not required for the purpose of investigation any more. It is submitted that the accused/ applicant belongs to a poor strata of the society and his family has come on the verge of starvation, in his absence. No purpose shall be served by keeping him behind bars. It has been prayed that the application be allowed and the accused/ applicant be released on bail.

Per contra, ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application citing the seriousness of the allegations and gravity of the offence. It is submitted that the accused/applicant played a pivotal role in the commission of the offence. It is submitted that there are clinching evidence against the accused/applicant and if enlarge on bail, he may abscond. It is prayed that the bail application be dismissed.

Considered.

At the outset, it is observed that all the contentions taken by the Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant have been considered in the last order dated 10.02.2026 whereby the first bail application of the accused/applicant was dismissed. No change of circumstances since then has been mentioned in the application. The CDRs are not the only evidence against the accused/applicant and as such, the judgments relied upon by Ld. Counsel for the accused/acpplicant are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case as on date. The

bail applications of the co-accused persons have also been dismissed recently.

As such, in view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, in particular, the nature of allegations, role assigned and stage of the proceedings, I find no merits in the present application and the same is hereby disposed off as dismissed.

Dasti to all concerned.

(Bhupinder Singh)
ASJ-05, Central District
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
21.02.2026