

Bail Matters 1098/2026
STATE Vs. RANJAN
FIR No. 259/2026
PS- (Kalindi Kunj)
u/s 115(2)/126(2)/351(2)/333/3(5)/191(2)/192(1) BNS

29.04.2026

Present application has been 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 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Ranjan for grant of anticipatory bail.

Present: Sh. S. K. Sharma and Sh. Roshan Singh, Ld.
Counsel for the applicant/accused.
Sh. Yogendra Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State along
with IO/SI Ajay Chauhan.

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

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present matter as he has nothing to do with the alleged offences. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused was not present at the place of crime as he was with his father at Sector 37 Noida, U.P. and this may be evident from the CCTV camera installed near the place of occurrence. Ld. Counsel further submitted that all the allegations levelled against the applicant/accused are false and fabricated and no specific reole or overt act has been attributed to

the applicant/accused. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the present case FIR is a result of a local and pre-existing dispute between the parties and has been lodged by the complainant Pinki with mala fide intentions. Ld. Counsel further submitted that one of the co-accused named in the present FIR namely Tanu @ Gungun has already been granted regular bail by Ld. CJM, South East and that co-accused Rohit @ Dhobi has also been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 15.04.2026. Ld. Counsel further submitted that applicant/accused herein is ready to join the investigation as and when required by the IO. Ld Counsel thus, submitted that anticipatory bail ought to be granted to the applicant/accused and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him by this court.

3. *Per contra*, Ld. Addl PP for State along with IO vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application as per law. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the present applicant/accused is a friend of co-accused Rohit and at the time of incident, he came along with co-accused and his other friends and beat complainant and entered into her house's stairs to chase her and he was actively participated in the incident and thus, anticipatory bail ought not to be granted to the applicant/accused. However, IO fairly conceded that the role of the present applicant/accused is similar to co-accused Rohit, who has already been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 15.04.2026.

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

5. During the course of arguments, it was brought to the fore that the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is not

required. Further, during the course of arguments, Ld. Addl. PP along with IO fairly conceded that the role of the present applicant/accused is similar to co-accused Rohit, who has already been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 15.04.2026. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused also submitted that the applicant/accused is ready to join the investigation as and when required by the IO. It is cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent till his guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt.

6. The parameters governing anticipatory bail were laid down by a Constitution bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565** wherein it was held that while considering grant or denial of bail, the court has to consider (1) Gravity of offence; (2) Nature of Evidence on record against the accused; (3) Likelihood of accused committing further offences; (4) Previous criminal antecedents; (5) Likelihood of accused absconding or evading process of law and (6) Larger interest of the public or the State.

7. In case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra (2011) 1 SCC 694**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that:

“Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case”

8. In the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the submissions made, I deem it fit to grant anticipatory bail to accused Ranjan on the following conditions:-

a) In the event of arrest, applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the SHO/IO.

b) The applicant shall join the investigation as and when called by the IO.

c) The applicant is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.

d) The applicant shall give his address to the IO and if he changes the addresses he shall intimate the same to the IO.

e) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, contact or pressurize the complainant or any other witness. In case any complaint is received from the complainant that the applicant is trying to contact him/her and trying to put pressure on him/her then the protection granted by this Court shall stand cancelled.

f) If any condition of the anticipatory bail are violated, the State is at liberty to move an application for cancellation of anticipatory bail.

9. 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 anticipatory bail application stands disposed of.

10. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)
ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),
South East District, Saket Court,
New Delhi /29.04.2026