

Bail Matters 678/2026  
STATE Vs. SALEEM  
FIR No. 29/2026  
PS- (Kalkaji)  
u/s 25/54/59 of Arms Act

13.03.2026

**Present application has been being taken up in terms of Order No. 10 dated 06.03.2026 passed by Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge, SED, Saket Courts, New Delhi. (Roster)**

**This is an application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Saleem for grant of regular bail.**

Present: None for the State.  
Ms. Sarita Bhatt, Ld. Counsel for the  
applicant/accused.  
IO/HC Manoj is present.

1. Vide this order, I shall adjudicate upon the regular bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Saleem. Arguments were heard at length, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been languishing in JC since 02.01.2026 and that he has been falsely implicated in the present matter by the police as he has nothing to do with the alleged offences. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the allegations made in the FIR are false, frivolous and baseless. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the previous regular bail application of the applicant/accused was dismissed by Ld. JMFC concerned vide

order dated 09.03.2026 and the main reason for the dismissal of his bail application was that he might influence the complainant, but there are no chances of influencing the witnesses as all the witnesses are police officials. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the investigation of the case has already been completed and chargesheet has been filed and therefore, no purpose would be served by keeping the applicant/accused in JC further. He also submitted that the applicant/accused is a very poor person and his entire family are depended upon him. Ld. Counsel thus, submitted that applicant/accused ought to be granted bail and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him while granting the bail.

3. *Per contra* IO/HC Manoj vehemently opposed the bail application as per law. IO further submitted that the applicant/accused is a habitual offender as he is a BC of PS Govind Puri and that his family is not having any control upon him. IO also submitted that accused has several previous involvements in other criminal cases and there is strong possibility that he may commit similar crime, if enlarged on bail. Thus, accused ought not to be granted bail.

4. I have heard the arguments addressed by the opposite parties and also perused the record.

5. It is settled law that the Court, while considering the application for grant of bail, has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a *prima facie* case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of

the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment, the danger of the accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail; reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened; etc. However, at the same time, period of incarceration is also a relevant factor that is to be considered.

6. As per the report filed by the IO, the applicant/accused has been found previously involved in many other cases. However, it has been admitted that he has already been enlarged on bail in all those cases. Further, during the course of arguments, it was brought to the fore that the investigation of the present case has been completed and chargesheet has already been filed before the court concerned. No further custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is required. The alleged recovery of buttandaar knife has already been effected from the applicant/accused.

7. In the aforementioned circumstances, taking into account the submissions and the fact that investigation qua the applicant/accused is complete, chargesheet is filed and that the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is not required for the further purpose of the investigation, I deem it fit to grant regular bail to accused Saleem, s/o Sh. Sakeel Ahmad, on his furnishing personal bond with surety bond of Rs. 15,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of Ld. JMFC/Link JMFC/Duty JMFC/Court concerned, subject to the following conditions:

i) The applicant/accused shall not try to contact or influence the prosecution witness in any manner;

ii) He shall not tamper with evidence in any manner and shall regularly appear before the concerned court on each and every date of hearing; and

iii) He shall also furnish his mobile phone and mobile phone of his surety to the IO and shall keep his mobile phone operational round the clock and shall share his Google PIN to IO.

8. Needless to say, the abovementioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the regular bail application stands disposed of.

9. In compliance of **Sanjay Singh Vs. State (Govt of N.C.T of Delhi) Writ Petition Criminal 974/2022**, copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent to convey the order to inmate.

10. Copy of the order be given dasti.

**(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)**  
**ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),**  
**South East District, Saket Court,**  
**New Delhi /13.03.2026**