

**Bail Application No. 418/2026
State Vs. Mahrukh Khan @ Makku
FIR No. 80096879/2025
PS: Karol Bagh**

06.03.2026

This is the first application under Sec. 483 BNSS filed on behalf of applicant/accused namely Mahrukh Khan @ Makku for grant of regular bail.

Present : Sh. M. A. Khan, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Rakesh Tripathi, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.
SI Kunal in person.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that no bail application is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

Reply to the bail application has been filed on behalf of IO. Same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.

Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant submits that accused/applicant is in JC since 10.12.2025. He submits that accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that there is no eyewitness of the alleged incident and the CCTV footage has been recorded from a distance from which the face of accused/applicant is not clear. He further submits that the investigation in the present case has already been completed and the charge-sheet has been filed. He further submits that no fruitful purpose will be served by keeping the accused/applicant in JC and hence he should be granted bail.

Per contra, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State submits that the incident has been recorded in the CCTV camera and the accused/applicant has been arrested on the basis of secret information. He submits that one gold chain and ear ring belonging to the complainant has been recovered from possession of accused/applicant which has been duly identified by the complainant in the TIP proceedings and hence accused/applicant is directly connected to the commission of offence in the present case. He further submits that co-accused is yet to be arrested. He also submits that the charges in the present case are yet to be framed. He further submits that accused/applicant is previously involved in several cases of similar nature and if he is granted bail, he may again commit offence of similar nature. He submits that the present bail application of accused/applicant should be dismissed.

I have heard the submissions and perused the record.

In the present case, theft of jewellery articles worth Rs. 75 lakhs has taken place. The incident has been covered in the CCTV camera. Though, the face of accused/applicant is not clear in the CCTV footage but on his arrest, the jewellery articles belonging to the complainant has been recovered from his possession which have been duly identified by the complainant in the TIP proceedings. Accused/applicant has not brought anything on record indicating his false implication in the present case. He has also not explained the possession of jewellery articles belonging to the complainant. One co-accused is yet to be arrested and the remaining jewellery articles are yet to be

recovered. Accused/applicant is previously involved in several cases of similar nature and if he is granted bail, he may again commit offences of similar nature. Charges are yet to be framed and the complainant is yet to be examined as PW. Granting bail to the accused/applicant before examination of complainant may defeat the purpose of law.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any merit in the present bail application.

Accordingly, the present bail application filed under Sec. 483 BNSS for grant of regular bail to accused/applicant is hereby dismissed.

The observations made herein shall not have any effect on the merits of case.

The bail application stands disposed off accordingly.

Copy of this order be given Dasti to all concerned.

(Virender Kumar Kharta)
ASJ/FTC-02(CENTRAL)
TIS HAZARI COURTS:DELHI :06.03.2026