

Bail Matter No. 1704/2026
FIR NO. 52/2026
PS LODHI COLONY
U/s. 115(2)/126(2)/127(2)/134/303(2)/351(2)(3)
/74/75/307/333/238(C)/61(2)/3(5) BNS
STATE Vs. SOUMYA DHWAJ

10.06.2026

Present application is being taken up pursuant to Order No. 32 and No. Judl. Vacation/F-83/South-East/Saket/2026/5594-5644 dated 25.05.2025 passed by Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, South-East District, Saket Courts.

Present: Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Mr. Sumit Saini, Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused.
Mr. Dhruv Gupta alongwith Ms. Mana Singh, Mr.
Anubhav Garg and Mr. Pranshu Pandey, Ld.
Counsels for complainant.

This is an application filed U/s. 483 BNSS on behalf of applicant/accused Soumya Dhwaaj for grant of bail.

IO SI Sumit Yadav is present and has filed reply to bail application. Be taken on record.

Reply perused.

Arguments heard on application from both sides.

1. The FIR in this case has been registered on complaint of Dr. Karan Singh who is president of Shree Ramayana Vidhyapeeth, 15, Institutional Area, Lodhi Colony, Delhi. As per FIR, the said temple and society were founded by Late Pandit Kapindra (great grandfather of applicant/accused Soumya Dhwaaj). After his demise in 1983, his nephew Pandit Narendra Dhwaaj (grantfather of applicant/accused Soumya Dhwaaj) continued in the management committee of the said

Contd....

society and resided in the temple premises. Pandit Narendra Dhway used to reside/perform Ramkatha for the devotees in the temple. Pandit Narendra Dhway expired in year 2024. After his death applicant/accused with his father i.e. co-accused Shailender Dhway continue to occupy residential quarter in the temple premises, although, he is not in management committee of the society.

2. As per FIR, applicant/accused Soumya Dhway and his father Shailender Dhway and their accomplices, in the intervening night of 08/09.05.2026 trespassed into temple premises and repeatedly attempted to take its wrongful possession. They also threatened the private security guards namely Ravi and Roshan deputed by management committee in the temple and wrongfully confined them in the temple premises while snatching away their mobile phones. Applicant/accused and his accomplices stole important documents like account books, statutory records, property papers, bank record, cheque books, cash, valuables, paintings and articles belonging to the management. They also misbehaved with female security staff present in the temple premises. They removed the priest appointed by the management committee and forcibly kept another priest in the temple.

3. IO has reported that some of the stolen documents were sold by the applicant/accused to *kabadi* shop (junk dealer) in INA Market area, whereas, some documents were thrown in Yamuna river.

Contd....

4. Ld. Counsel for complainant and Ld. Addl. PP have argued that applicant/accused intended to take forcible and illegal control over the temple, threatened and misbehaved with the security staff and committed theft of documents and valuables belonging to the management committee.

5. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused argued that applicant/accused and his family lawfully reside in the temple premises and his ancestor i.e. Late Pandit Kapindra was the founder of the temple and management committee. He argued that applicant/accused and his family had differences with management committee over running of the temple. He argued that even as per FIR no weapon was used in the incident. He argued that, as an afterthought, the complainant Dr. Karan Singh, who was not even present at the time of alleged incident, made false accusation of misbehaviour with female security staff and theft of valuable documents and cash from the temple.

6. Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused argued that applicant/accused is aged 31 years and is a practicing advocate in Delhi. He has no prior criminal record. It is submitted that the applicant/accused is in JC since 09.05.2026 and investigation as against him is already complete. It is argued that except alleged offence of misbehaviour with female security staff, punishable u/s. 74 BNS, all other reported offences are triable by Magistrate.

Contd....

7. The incident seems to be outcome of differences between family of applicant/accused and management committee over control of affairs of the temple. The applicant/accused allegedly trespassed into the temple during night time along with accomplices to forcibly take control over it, over awed the security staff, took away documents of management committee and forcibly removed priest appointed by the management committee. As reported, no weapon was used by offenders in the alleged incident and no injury was caused to anyone. The investigation as against applicant/accused is complete. No prior criminal involvement has been alleged against him.

8. In the facts and circumstances of the case, applicant/accused Soumya Dhvaj is admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of Ld. Trial Court. The bail is further subject to condition that applicant/accused shall not attempt to interfere with activities of Shree Ramayana Vidhyapeeth or management thereof without following due legal procedure.

The bail application is disposed of accordingly.

Copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent, for information.

Copy of this order be also given dasti to Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused, as prayed for.

(VISHAL SINGH)
ASJ-05, SOUTH-EAST DISTRICT
VACATION JUDGE, SAKET COURTS
NEW DELHI:10.06.2026