

CNR No. DLSE01-011190-2026

Bail Matter No. 2655/2026

State Vs. Anil

FIR No. 242/2026

PS Sarita Vihar

10.09.2026

Present : Mr. Gurbhej Singh Guraya, Ld. Public Prosecutor
for the State.

Ms. Moni Rexwal, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Mr. Sandeep, Ld. Counsel for deceased with mother
of deceased.

1. This order shall decide bail application of accused Anil.
2. The police had come into action on receipt of DD No. 85A dated 22.05.2026 timed at 04:58 pm to the effect that a male and female had become unconscious due to a chemical leak in the car. The police reached the spot of occurrence near Burger King, main road towards Shaheen Bagh Metro Station, Jasola, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi and found a Wagon-R car bearing registration No. DL-3CDB-1668 parked on one side of the road. The police noticed that an acid like chemical substance had spilled over in the vehicle. The police further came to know that occupants of the vehicle were male and female and they had already been shifted to AIIMS, Trauma Center, Delhi. The forensic mobile crime team reached there who seized suspected chemical from the car and also one plastic bottle containing the suspected chemical. The bottle was lying near the driver seat. Then, the

police reached to the hospital and came to know that the applicant with 45% burn injuries and deceased with 58% burn injuries had been admitted there. The applicant was discharged from hospital on 28.05.2026 whereas the victim breathed her last on 31.05.2026 due to burn injuries and thereafter, the Section 106(1) of BNS was invoked.

After detailed interrogation of the applicant, the police came to the conclusion that the applicant, being a qualified bachelor of Medical Laboratory Technician, possessed the requisite knowledge regarding the dangerous nature of chemical substance and the risk associated therewith and hence, invoked Section 105 BNS and he was arrested on 16.06.2026.

3. The counsel for applicant argued that his client had collected a phenyl bottle from his office where he was working as Lab Technician. He kept the bottle between front two seats. The victim was also going to her house and so, she also sat on the way in the front seat. In the way, due to excessive heat, the phenyl bottle became hot and burst due to which both persons sustained injuries. He further submitted that even after getting out of the car, both tried to save each other by throwing water upon them. So, the incident might have taken place due to rash and negligent act and not due to any intention. The applicant has been wrongly arrested under Section 105 BNS and that there should have been no arrest because the applicant had not committed any offence.

4. On the other hand, the counsel for complainant argued that victim was the tenant of the applicant. He wanted to marry her

and when she refused, he sprinkled chemical on her body due to which she expired. He further submitted that it had been wrongly mentioned in the bail application that this is second bail application. Rather, it is third one.

5. The counsel for complainant is not wrong to say that this is third bail application. The first was anticipatory bail application. The second was the regular bail application filed before the filing of the chargesheet. Present bail application is third one which has been filed after submission of chargesheet. Though, it is mentioned in the caption that it is second bail application but perusal of body of the bail application shows that it is crystal clearly mentioned that the present is third one.

6. It is now the admitted case of the parties that the applicant was the landlord and victim was tenant. They were not only landlord and tenant and rather they were more than that as the chargesheet suggests that in the last one month, applicant had made 349 phone calls to the victim and victim also did not lag behind as she called him 318 times in that period.

Two persons namely Mohit and Kiran are working in the office where the applicant was employed and they made statement to the police that on 22.05.2026, the applicant had collected Lysol I. P Floor Cleaner bottled from the office in order to take the same to his house. They further told that in that office, the said liquid is used for mopping and that said liquid had not caused any burn injury or any other kind of injury to anybody in the office. Then, the police recorded statement of first informant Miskat s/o Mumtaz who told that when he reached the spot on

22.05.2026 at about 05:00 pm, he saw a male and female standing outside their vehicle and they were throwing water upon each other in order to lessen the effect of burn. He intimated police. As per him, they were trying to save each other.

Pushpa, a colleague of the victim, told police that she was working with victim for last six years. On 22.05.2026, she and victim were standing on a bus stand near New Friends Colony when the applicant came there in his Wagon-R car and both boarded the car. She sat in rear seat whereas the victim sat in the front left seat. She alighted in the way. During her entire trip, she did not witness any dispute, quarrel or fight between applicant and victim.

Even victim's mother Geeta Kahar and her husband Sapan Mandal did not point finger towards the applicant in their statement saying that his behaviour towards their family was up to the mark. Despite it, they had expressed some apprehension that the matter be investigated so that if there was any ill will of the applicant towards victim, the same may come to the fore.

The victim had sustained 58% burn injuries whereas the applicant had 45% burn injuries.

At this stage, there is nothing on file to justify the arguments of the counsel for complainant that the applicant intended to marry victim and when she refused, he killed her by throwing chemical on her. It is pertinent to mention that the applicant as well as victim were the married persons.

The chargesheet has already been filed. So, the applicant is no more required in custody. The trial of the case is likely to take

long time to conclude.

7. Taking into account the facts and circumstances, the applicant / accused Anil is admitted to bail on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like amount. The application is accordingly disposed of.

(UMED SINGH)

Principal District & Sessions Judge
South East District, Saket Courts,
New Delhi. 10.09.2026 (ar)