

IN THE COURT OF SH. RAVINDER SINGH-II
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (SOUTH-WEST)-05
DWARKA COURTS: DELHI

Date of Judgment: 03.08.2026
Sessions Case No. 729/2019
FIR No. 420/2019
U/s. 307/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act
PS : Bindapur

Complainant:	Neeraj Singh
REPRESENTED BY	State
ACCUSED PERSONS	1. Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala S/o : Late Sh. Om Prakash R/o : RZ-106, Sukhi Ram Park, Uttam Nagar, Matiala, New Delhi. 2. Pradeep Solanki@ Bunt S/o Late Sh. Randhir Singh R/o : B-1/3, Nanhe Park, Opp Govt. School, Matiala, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi.
REPRESENTED BY	Shri V. S. Chauhan, Deputy Legal Aid Defence counsel for both the accused.

Date of Offence	26.05.2019
Date of FIR	27.05.2019
Date of Charge-sheet	26.08.2019
Date of Framing of Charges	14.09.2022
Date of commencement of evidence	28.01.2023
Date of which judgment is reserved	01.08.2026
Date of the Judgment	03.08.2026
Final Order	Acquitted

Accused Details:

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offence charged with	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of section 428, Cr.P.C.
1.	Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ KalaKumar@ Ishdev@ KalaKumar @ Ishdev @ Kala	29.05.2019	25.11.2020	307/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act	Acquitted	NA	NA
2.	Pradeep Solanki@ Bunti Solanki@ Bunti Solanki@ Bunti Solanki @ Banti	27.05.2019	26.09.2019	307/34 IPC & 25/27 Arms Act	Acquitted	NA	NA

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS. OTHER WITNESS)
Head Constable	Kabul Singh	Police witness
Retired Sub-Inspector	Ramesh Chand	Police witness
Head Constable	Jagdish Prasad	Police witness
Assistant Sub-Inspector	Anil Kumar	Police witness
Junior Forensic Chemical Examiner, Biology, FSL	Ms. Amita Raghav	Expert witness
Sub-Inspector	Dharamveer	Police witness

B. Defence Witness, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS. OTHER WITNESS)
		NIL

C. Court Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH
------	------	--

		WITNESS. OTHER WITNESS)
		Nil

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Ex.PW1/A	Seizure memo of knife.
2	Ex.PW1/B	Sketch of the knife.
3	Ex.PW1/C	Site plan of place of recovery.
4	Ex.P1	Knife.
5	Ex.PW2/A (OSR)	Copy of FIR.
6	Ex.PW2/B	Endorsement on rukka.
7	Ex.PW2/C	Certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act.
8	Ex.PW3/A	DD No.134A.
9	Ex.PW4/A	Arrest memo of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala
10	Ex.PW4/B	Personal search memo of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala
11	Ex.PW4/C	Disclosure statement of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala
12	Ex.PW4/D	Kalandara under Section 41.1(a) Cr.P.C.

13	Ex.PW5/A	Report prepared by FSL Expert.
14	Ex.PW5/B	Allelic Data Chart.
15	Ex.A1	DD No. 34A.
16	Ex.PW6/A	Statement of injured.
17	Ex.PW6/B	Rukka.
18	Ex.PW6/C	Seizure memo of clothes of the injured.
19	Ex.PW6/D	Arrest memo of accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty
20	Ex.PW6/E	Personal search memo of accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty
21	Ex.PW6/F	Disclosure statement memo of accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty
22	Ex.PW6/G	Pointing out memo of place of incident.
23	Ex.PW6/H	Arrest memo of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala
24	Ex.PW6/I	Disclosure statement of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala
25	Ex.PW6/J	Site plan at the instance of injured.
26	Ex.PW6/K	Site identification memo.

27	Ex.PW6/L	Seizure memo of clothes.
28	Ex.A2	MLC of Neeraj.
29	Ex.A3	X-ray report of Neeraj.
30	Ex.A4	Opinion of Dr. B. N. Mishra.

B. Defence:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	Nil	Nil

C. Court Exhibits

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	Nil	Nil

D. Material Objects:

Sr. No.	Material Object Number	Description
	Nil	Nil

JUDGMENT

PROLOGUE

1. The Accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty and Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala have been charge sheeted for the offence punishable under Section 307 read with Section 34 of the Indian

Penal Code (*herein after said as IPC*) and Section 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959. The allegations concern a knife injury allegedly inflicted by them in furtherance of their common intention upon the complainant Neeraj Singh on the night of 26.05.2019.

2. On the basis of the charge sheet/ police report, the then Learned Metropolitan Magistrate took cognizance of the offences against both the accused persons and complied with the statutory provisions of Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter said as 'Cr.PC'*) and committed the case to the Court of Sessions vide order dated 23.09.2019.

CHARGE

3. Thereafter, after hearing the Learned Addl. PP for the State and the Learned counsel for the accused persons, the Learned Predecessor of this Court vide order dated 14.09.2022, framed charge against both the accused persons for the offences punishable under Sections 307/34 of the IPC only, to which both the accused persons pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

PROSECUTION CASE

4. Briefly stating, the case of the prosecution is that on 26.05.2019, at about 10:15 p.m., information was received at Police Station Bindapur regarding stabbing of his son during quarrel near House No. B-82, Matiala Extension, Tiranga Chowk, New Delhi. The said information was recorded vide DD No. 134A and was assigned to SI Dharmveer for inquiry.

5. Thereafter, SI Dharmveer, accompanied by Constable Sohan Pal, reached the spot. But by then, the injured had been removed to the hospital and on receiving information from DDU Hospital, the Investigating Officer went there and found injured Neeraj Singh admitted with a stab injury (sharp). The Investigating Officer thereafter recorded the statement of the complainant Neeraj Singh, prepared the rukka and got the FIR of the present case registered and investigation was carried out and after completion of the investigation, the charge-sheet was filed against both the accused persons.

6. The prosecution has alleged that on 26.05.2019 at about 9:45 PM at Matiala Extension, Bindapur, New Delhi both the accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kalaand accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty in furtherance of their common intention stabbed the complainant Neeraj in his abdomen with such intention or knowledge and under such circumstances that if by the said act they would have caused death of the complainant Neeraj, they would have been guilty of murder.

EVIDENCE LEAD BY THE PROSECUTION

7. In order to prove its case, the prosecution in total has only examined six witnesses namely *PW1/ HC. Kabul Singh, PW2/ Retired SI Ramesh Chand, PW3/ HC Jagdish Prasad, PW4/ ASI Anil Kumar, PW5/ Ms Amita Raghav and the IO/ PW6 SI Dharamveer.*

8. *Now coming to the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses in detail.* PW-1 HC Kabul Singh was examined as a witness to the alleged recovery dated 30.05.2019. He stated that accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala had taken the police party to Dust Park, Budh Bazaar Road, Matiala and produced a button-operated knife from the bushes. He proved the seizure memo **Ex. PW-1/A**, sketch of the knife **Ex. PW-1/B** and site plan of the place of recovery **Ex. PW-1/C**. He also identified the knife **Ex. P-1**, when it was produced before the Court.

9. PW-2, Retired SI Ramesh Chand, proved the registration of the FIR, his endorsement upon the rukka and the certificate under Section 65-B of the Evidence Act. PW-3 HC Jagdish Prasad proved DD No. 134A. The DD entry establishes receipt of information concerning a quarrel and stabbing, but it does not mention the name or description of either assailant.

10. PW-4 ASI Anil Kumar deposed about the apprehension of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala by the Crime Branch on 28.05.2019 and proved the documents prepared in connection with his arrest. His testimony at the highest proves the circumstances in which accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala came into police custody. The secret information allegedly received by PW-4 and the disclosure allegedly made before him are not substantive evidence of Anil's involvement in the assault.

11. PW-5 Ms. Amita Raghav, Junior Forensic Chemical

Examiner, proved the biological and DNA examination report **Ex. PW-5/A** and the allelic data chart **Ex. PW-5/B**. She stated that blood was detected on all the exhibits except Exhibit-I and that the detailed results were recorded in her report.

12. PW-6 SI Dharmveer, the Investigating Officer, proved the steps taken during investigation, including the recording of the statement attributed to Neeraj Singh, preparation of the rukka, seizure of the injured's clothes, arrest of the accused persons, preparation of the site plan and the alleged recovery of the knife at the instance of accused Anil. He also proved that the exhibits were sent for subsequent medical opinion and forensic examination.

13. DD No. 34A regarding intimation given about preparation of MLC of injured / victim Neeraj, the MLC of the injured/ victim Neeraj and X-ray report of injured Neeraj Singh and the subsequent medical opinion of Dr B.N Mishra were admitted by both the accused persons under Section 294 CrPC and were exhibited as **Ex. A-1 to Ex. A-4**. Their admission establishes the information received and the medical facts recorded therein. These documents does not, however, establish the identity of the person who caused the injury to the complainant/ victim Neeraj.

14. *It is interesting to note that the injured/ complainant/ star witness of the Prosecution namely Neeraj was not examined by the prosecution, as his presence could not be secured despite efforts. Accordingly the said witness was dropped from the list of*

prosecution witnesses vide order dated 16.04.2026. As the remaining prosecution witnesses were merely formal witnesses and would not have materially aided the prosecution case and further as the Investigating Officer had already been examined. Consequently, no further prosecution evidence was recorded and the same was closed vide order dated 08.06.2026.

15. The record therefore makes it clear that complainant/ injured Neeraj Singh was not deliberately withheld by the prosecution. Efforts were made to secure his presence, but without success. Nevertheless, the legal effect of his non-examination has to be determined on the evidence that is actually before the Court. The inability of the prosecution to produce a material witness may be understandable, but it cannot result in the statement of that witness being treated as substantive evidence contrary to law.

STATEMENT OF ACCUSED PERSONS

16. After completion of prosecution evidence, statement of both accused persons under Section 313 Cr.P.C. was recorded. Accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala denied the arrest and recovery attributed to him and claimed that he had been falsely implicated because he was a bad character of Police Station Bindapur. It is further submitted by the accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala that he has not done anything to the injured and he has no relationship with him. In his statement, the accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty also denied the entire case of the prosecution and stated that he has been falsely implicated and he

had already been admitted to the Nasha Mukti Kendra and had not participated in the incident and despite the same the police had brought him from Nasha Mukti Kendra and has falsely implicated him in the present case.

FINAL ARGUMENTS

FINAL ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE PROSECUTION

17. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State argued that the occurrence stood proved from the DD entry and the medical record. Reliance was placed by the Learned Additional Prosecutor for the State upon the statement attributed to injured Neeraj Singh, the recovery of the knife at the instance of accused Anil, the subsequent medical opinion and the FSL report. It was contended that the inability to examine the injured should not result in failure of the prosecution case as the other witnesses have duly supported the prosecution case.

FINAL ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE ACCUSED PERSONS.

18. Learned Legal Aid Defence counsel for both the accused persons, on the other hand, submitted that complainant/ injured Neeraj Singh was the only person who could have identified the assailants and specified the role attributed to each accused. It is further contended that none of the witnesses examined by the Prosecution before the Court had seen the assault. It was argued that the statement attributed to Neeraj Singh was not substantive evidence and could not be used to prove the truth of its contents

in his absence when he has not stepped into the witness box and has not been examined by the Prosecution. It is further contended that the alleged recovery was also doubtful on the ground that it was made from an open place accessible to the public and no independent witness was joined and even PW-1 failed to identify accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala in Court and instead has identified accused Pradeep Solanki@ Buntty as Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala during his testimony. *Accordingly, it is prayed that both the accused persons are entitled to be acquitted.*

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

19. The question requiring determination is whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that both the accused persons, in furtherance of their common intention stabbed the complainant / injured Neeraj Singh with such intention or knowledge and under such circumstances that, had death been caused, they would have been guilty of murder, thereby committing an offence under Section 307 / 34 of the IPC. Section 307 of the IPC reads as under:

307. Attempt to murder.—Whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge, and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine; and if hurt is caused to any person by such act, the offender shall be liable either to imprisonment for life, or to such punishment as is hereinbefore mentioned.

20. From the plain reading of the aforesaid provision it is apparently clear that in order to constitute an offence under Section 307 of the IPC two elements are essential to be established. *First*, the intention or knowledge to commit murder.

Secondly, the actual act of trying to commit the murder. Thus, it must have both the necessary mens rea and actus reus. Hence, to sustain a conviction under this section, it is necessary to establish that had the accused succeeded in his attempt and had the victim met his death because of such act, the offence of murder punishable u/s 302 IPC would be established.

21. Further it is trite law that the nature and extent of injury is neither essential nor determinative. This principle was discussed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Saleem @ Chamaru, (2005) 5 SCC 554*, the relevant paragraph of which reads hereunder:

“12. To justify a conviction under this section, it is not essential that bodily injury capable of causing death should have been inflicted. Although the nature of injury actually caused may often give considerable assistance in coming to a finding as to the intention of the accused, such intention may also be deduced from other circumstances, and may even, in some cases, be ascertained without any reference at all to actual wounds. The section makes a distinction between an act of the accused and its result, if any. Such an act may not be attended by any result so far as the person assaulted is concerned, but still there may be cases in which the culprit would be liable under this section. It is not necessary that the injury actually caused to the victim of the assault should be sufficient under ordinary circumstances to cause the death of the person assaulted. What the court has to see is whether the act, irrespective of its result, was done with the intention or knowledge and under circumstances mentioned in the section. An attempt in order to be criminal need not be the penultimate act. It is sufficient in law, if there is present an intent coupled with some overt act in execution thereof.”

22. The intention or knowledge of the accused is the primary facet which can be gathered from the weapon used, the part of the body targeted, the force of the attack, the nature of the injury, the words spoken and the surrounding circumstances. This

principle has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Bipin Bihari v. State of M.P. (2006) 8 SCC 799***. Relevant portion of the said Judgment is as under :

“9. It is sufficient to justify a conviction under Section 307 if there is present an intent coupled with some overt act in execution thereof. It is not essential that bodily injury capable of causing death should have been inflicted. Although the nature of injury actually caused may often give considerable assistance in coming to a finding as to the intention of the accused, such intention may also be deduced from other circumstances, and may even, in some cases, be ascertained without any reference at all to actual wounds. The section makes a distinction between the act of the accused and its result, if any. The court has to see whether the act, irrespective of its result, was done with the intention or knowledge and under circumstances mentioned in the section. An attempt in order to be criminal need not be the penultimate act. It is sufficient in law, if there is present an intent coupled with some overt act in execution thereof”

23. However, evidently before the question of intention or knowledge can be considered, the prosecution must first prove that the act in question was committed by the accused. The seriousness of an injury cannot substitute proof concerning the identity of the assailant. Likewise, Section 34 of the IPC does not create a substantive offence. Its application requires proof that the criminal act was done by several persons in furtherance of their common intention.

24. The prosecution evidence in the present case establishes that the complainant/ injured Neeraj Singh suffered a sharp injury in the night of 26.05.2019. The DD entry, the MLC and the other medical documents provide sufficient proof of that fact. The more difficult question is whether either of the accused has been proved to be the inflictor of the said injury.

25. The complainant / injured Neeraj Singh has not entered the witness box. His presence could not be secured despite efforts leading to he being dropped from the list of witnesses on 16.04.2026 and evidently there is no substantive testimony on record from the injured identifying either of the accused persons or describing the manner in which the assault took place.

26. The statement attributed to complainant/ injured Neeraj Singh and proved by PW-6 as *Ex. PW-6/A* formed the basis of the rukka and registration of the FIR. Whether treated as the first information given to the police or as a statement recorded during investigation, it is not substantive evidence of the facts stated therein. Such a statement can be used for corroborating or contradicting its maker when he enters the witness box and evidently merely exhibition of the statement through the Investigating Officer does not prove the truth of its contents.

27. The Court cannot fill the evidentiary silence caused by the absence of Neeraj Singh by reading his statement Ex. PW-6/A given to the police as though he had appeared and testified on oath. The Investigating Officer can prove that he recorded the statement, but he cannot prove, on behalf of its maker, that the occurrence took place in the manner narrated therein or that the accused persons were the assailants.

28. None of the six prosecution witnesses witnessed the assault. PW-2 and PW-3 are formal witnesses. PW-4 is a witness to the

arrest of accused Anil. PW-1 is a witness to the alleged recovery. PW-5 examined the exhibits in the laboratory. PW-6 reached the spot after the injured had already been removed. Therefore, there is no substantive ocular evidence placing either of the accused persons at the scene of crime at the relevant time.

29. The medical evidence though establishes the injury and may also show that an injury of that nature was possible with a weapon such as Ex. P-1. Medical evidence, however, cannot ordinarily identify the person who wielded the weapon. Thus, even after the medical documents are read in their entirety, the identity of the assailants remains unproved.

30. Further, the evidence against accused Pradeep Solanki@Bunty is confined to his arrest, disclosure statement and pointing out of the place of occurrence. No weapon or other incriminating article was recovered from him. His alleged disclosure is inadmissible to the extent that it contains a confession made to a police officer. The pointing out of the place of occurrence also does not amount to discovery of a new fact because the place was already known to the police.

31. Furthermore, the fact that accused Pradeep Solanki@Bunty Solanki was found at a Nasha Mukti Kendra also does not by itself prove either his guilt or innocence. The Investigating Officer PW6/SI Dharmaveer in his testimony has admitted that he did not examine any member of the staff or collect the admission record of the centre to ascertain when accused Pradeep

Solanki@ Bunty had reached there. So, even if accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty has not independently established his plea of alibi, the failure of the defence to prove that plea shadow supply the deficiencies in the prosecution evidence.

31. As regards accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala, the prosecution principally relies upon the alleged recovery of knife Ex. P-1. PW-1 HC Kabul Singh, however, initially pointed towards co-accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty and identified him as Anil. Even when accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala was shown to him, PW-1 failed to identify him. He attributed the lapse to the passage of time. The explanation may account for some loss of memory, but the Court cannot overlook that PW-1 was the only recovery witness apart from the Investigating Officer and was unable to identify the person who allegedly led the police party to the weapon.

32. The knife Ex P-1 was allegedly recovered from bushes situated in a large and open ground where several building-material suppliers were operating. PW-1 admitted that the knife was visible in the bushes. The place was not shown to be under the exclusive control of the accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala. No person from the locality was joined, no photograph of the recovery was taken and no attempt was made to lift fingerprints from the knife.

33. Further, it is also interesting to note that PW-1 initially stated that the documents were prepared at the police station and

thereafter corrected himself by stating that they had been prepared at the spot. He could not recollect the departure or arrival DD numbers, the mode of transport or the time spent at the place of recovery. More importantly, he stated that his statement under Section 161 CrPC had been recorded on 27.05.2019, whereas the alleged recovery took place on 30.05.2019. This may be an error of memory, but it remains unexplained and assumes significance because the recovery is the principal circumstance relied upon by the prosecution against accused Anil Kumar @ Ishdev@ Kala.

34. It is well settled that the evidence of a police witness cannot be discarded merely because no independent witness was joined. There is no presumption that a police officer is untruthful. In the present case, however, the recovery is not being doubted merely for want of a public witness. The open and accessible nature of the place, the failure of PW-1 to identify accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala, the unexplained chronological discrepancy and the absence of fingerprints or other direct evidence cumulatively make it unsafe to place decisive reliance upon the recovery.

35. Moreover, under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, only that part of the information furnished by an accused in custody which distinctly relates to the fact discovered is admissible and evidently mere exhibition of disclosure statement or recovery memo does not prove its contents and that the Investigating Officer must prove the information and the sequence leading to discovery.

36. The IO/PW-6 also stated generally that accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala led the police party to the park and produced the knife. The exact information allegedly furnished by Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala was not reproduced in his testimony. A recovery from a visible place accessible to the public does not establish authorship of concealment. At the highest, it may indicate knowledge of the place where the article was lying. Such knowledge, without reliable evidence connecting Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala with the assault, is insufficient to sustain a conviction under Sections 307/34 IPC.

37. The FSL evidence on record also does not bridge this gap. Even if the forensic report and subsequent medical opinion are read at their highest in favour of the prosecution and taken to connect Ex. P-1 with the injury, they do not establish that accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala wielded the knife or that accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty shared any common intention with him. No fingerprint or biological material belonging to either accused was shown to have been found on the weapon.

38. There is also no substantive evidence on record describing the actual attack, the role attributed to each accused, the words spoken by them, the force employed, the part of the body deliberately targeted or the circumstances preceding and following the assault. In the absence of such evidence, the intention or knowledge required under Section 307 of the IPC cannot be inferred against either of the accused.

39. The prosecution has also failed to establish the ingredients of Section 34 of the IPC. There is also no substantive evidence showing that the accused persons arrived together, acted pursuant to any prior arrangement or developed a common intention at the spot. The recovery allegedly made at the instance of accused Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala cannot establish a meeting of minds between him and accused Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty.

40. The Court is conscious that defects in investigation do not invariably entitle an accused to acquittal and that otherwise trustworthy evidence cannot be discarded because the investigation was imperfect. The difficulty in the present case is more fundamental. There is no substantive evidence identifying either of the accused persons as an assailant. The investigative deficiencies only add to that central gap.

41. Therefore, the prosecution has only been able to prove that the complainant / injured Neeraj Singh sustained a sharp injury. It has, however, failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the injury was caused by either of the accused persons or that they acted in furtherance of any common intention. Evidently, suspicion arising from the allegations or the alleged recovery cannot take the place of legal proof. ***Consequently, giving the benefit of reasonable doubt, both the accused persons namely Pradeep Solanki@ Bunty and Anil Kumar@ Ishdev@ Kala are acquitted of the charge for the offence punishable under Section 307 read with Section 34 of the IPC.***

42. Bail bond and surety bond of both the accused persons stand cancelled. Their respective Sureties are discharged. Documents, if any, be released to the rightful person after cancellation of endorsement, if any.

Both the accused persons are directed to furnish bail bond under Section 437A Cr.P.C. in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- each with one surety of the like amount each, which shall remain in force for a period of six months.

Case property, if any, be disposed of as per rules after expiry of period of appeal/revision.

File be consigned to Record Room after due compliance.

**ANNOUNCED IN THE OPEN
COURT ON 03.08.2026**

**(Ravinder Singh-II)
ASJ-05 (South- West),
Dwarka Courts, Delhi**