

21 BAIL MATTERS 343/2026
STATE VS. KRISHNA KARTIK
FIR No. 676/2025
PS (NORTH ROHINI)

13.04.2026

Present : Sh. Pankaj Bhatia, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State.
Mr. Raj Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused.
IO/SI Sudesh and IO/ASI Ravinder are present in person.

1. The applicant/accused, Krishana Kartik has filed this application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sahinta (herein after “BNSS”) therein seeking regular bail. Pertinently, this application has been stated to be the 1st such application.

2. The applicant/accused has been stated to have been arrested on 29.10.2025 in connection with case FIR No.0676, dated 29.10.2025, lodged at PS North Rohini for offences punishable under Sections 109(1)/308(4)/61(2)/3(5) of the Bhartiya Nayay Sahinta (herein after “BNS”). The case at present is at the stage of framing of charge.

The case of prosecution:

3. The case of prosecution, as per the aforesaid FIR and reply/status report filed by the IO, broadly speaking, is as follows. The aforesaid FIR was registered upon the statement dated 29.10.2025 of the complainant, Balbir Singh, who had stated that on 15.10.2025, he had received a threatening call from the mobile no. 8512064053 therein demanding Rs. 1 Crore from him and directing delivery at Murthal. Thereafter, on 28.10.2025 at about 09:23 AM, while the complainant was proceeding towards his office near G-23, Sector-7, Rohini, two persons on a motorcycle came and one of them fired a gunshot at him. The said two persons also threatened the complainant and fled away from the spot.

4. During the course of investigation, it was discovered that while the applicant/accused herein was driving the aforesaid motorcycle, the pillion rider i.e. co-accused, namely Sahil fired a gunshot at the complainant. Both the accused persons were identified through CCTV footage from different locations, including the place of incident. Both the accused persons are also seen in the CCTV footage near the residence of the main accused, Deepanshu Swami, after the aforesaid incident. Both these accused persons were also identified through the clothes and slippers, which they were wearing at the time of committing the offence. The motorcycle, which was used for commission of the offense, was a stolen vehicle and the same was recovered at the instance of the applicant/accused herein. Further, the Call Detail Records and technical analysis thereof establishes that the presence of the applicant/accused was at the place of incident and his continuous contact with the other co-accused person. The Co-accused Deepanshu Swami has been discovered to be the mastermind who hatched the conspiracy and assigned the roles to other co-accused persons.

Submissions of Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused:

5. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submitted that the alleged firing incident was of 28.10.2025 at 09:25 AM, however, an FIR was lodged on the next date i.e. 29.10.2025. Ld. Counsel submitted that the applicant/accused cannot be identified from the CCTV footage. Ld. Counsel also submitted that the applicant/accused aged about 22 years is the sole bread earner in the family and that he has not been previously convicted for any offence. Ld. Counsel, lastly, submitted that the applicant/accused, if released on bail, shall abide by all the conditions as would be imposed by this Court.

Submissions of Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State:

6. Ld. Substitute Addl. P.P. for the State while relying upon the FIR and reply/status report filed by the IO has opposed the bail application on the ground that there are strong evidences against the applicant/accused. It was submitted that in view of the heinous nature of offence, there is an apprehension of the applicant/accused jumping the bail and /or influencing the prosecution witnesses.

Analysis and findings:

7. I have heard rival contentions from both the sides and have carefully perused the judicial record as well.

8. This Court, at the time of hearing the present bail application, watched the CCTV footage played by the IO. The IO stated that the said CCTV footage forms the part of the charge-sheet, which is not disputed by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused. In the said CCTV footage, two persons can be seen following the complainant on a motorcycle and firing at him. Further, the sound of the firing can also be heard. The said two persons can also be seen in another CCTV footage, which is stated to be of the place near the house of the co-accused, Deepanshu Swami, who has been stated to be the mastermind of the offence. Moreover, the motorcycle used in the commission of offence and the clothes worn by the applicant/accused herein and co-accused Sahil have also been recovered.

9. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused laid a lot of emphasis on the arguments that even as per the case of the prosecution, it was not the applicant/accused who fired a gunshot at the complainant. As per Section 3(5) of BNS, when a criminal act is done by several persons in furtherance of common intention of all, each such person is liable for that act in the manner as if it were done by him alone. Moreover, the applicant/accused, as per the prosecution case, was driving the motorcycle and thus he actively facilitated in firing at the complainant.

10. The applicant is accused of committing the offense of attempt to murder which is punishable under Section 109(1) of the BNS with imprisonment upto life. Further, he is also accused of the offence of extortion of money punishable under Section 308(4) upto three years. The offences committed by the applicant/accused are heinous in nature. The charge-sheet against the applicant/accused has already been filed which confirms the allegations against the applicant/accused herein. The trial is at its very initial stage wherein the complainant/eye-witnesses are yet to be examined.

11. In the conspectus of the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to release the applicant/accused on bail at this stage.

12. This bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

13. Nothing stated herein above shall tantamount to be the expression on the merits of the present case.

14. A copy of this Order be given *dasti* as prayed for. A copy of Order be also sent to the applicant/accused through Jail Authorities.

(Sachin Mittal)
ASJ-05/North-West District
Rohini Courts/Delhi/13.04.2026