

Bail No.229/2026
FIR No.7/2026
u/s 304 (2)/317(2) BNS
PS C R Park

State Vs. Rajan Yadav @ Reejan Yadav

06.02.2026

Present : Sh. L. D. Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Neelkanth Kumar, Ld. Counsel for accused/applicant.
IO ASI Kailash Chand Meena in person.

1. Today, the matter is fixed for consideration on application u/sec. 483 BNSS for seeking regular bail moved on behalf of accused /applicant Rajan Yadav @ Reejan Yadav.

2. Present bail application for seeking regular bail was filed on 28.01.2026.

3. The *brief facts* of this case as per reply of IO are that an FIR was registered on 10.01.2026 on the complaint of complainant Sameer Mahajan wherein he had alleged that on 09.01.2026 he had visited Park Royal Hotel, Nehru Place in auto bearing no. DL1RAA2676 and thereafter reached around 11:00 p.m. - 12:00 a.m. at Mandakini Enclave and while he was making payment to the auto driver by using his mobile phone, the auto driver suddenly snatched two mobile phones from the hands of complainant and robbed him and left the spot.

4. Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused has submitted that applicant/ accused is young age having clean antecedents. It has been

argued that applicant/ accused has been falsely implicated in this case and the recovery of the mobile phones from the accused / applicant is planted. It has further been argued that the applicant/ accused is not required for any custodial interrogation as nothing is required to be recovered from his possession and that accused has deep roots in society and shall abide by all the terms and conditions of bail, if granted.

5. Ld. Addl. PP for state has opposed the application on the ground that allegations are serious, investigation is at the nascent stage and in all probabilities, accused may repeat the offence, may tamper with the evidence and threaten the complainant/ victims, if granted bail. He has further argued that the alleged offence is serious in nature and applicant/ accused may flee away from justice, if granted bail.

6. IO has also opposed the bail application by referring the facts of this case and on the same grounds as was argued by Ld. Addl. PP for the state. It has been stated by the IO that in the present matter after the commission of offence, the FIR was registered immediately and in the complaint the complainant has specifically stated that he can identify the accused, if shown to him. Further, the TIP proceedings in the present matter is pending. IO has also stated that complainant in present matter is traveling to Dubai and shall return back on 16.02.2026. Further, that the TIP proceedings are now pending for 23.02.2026.

7. I have heard the arguments advanced by Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused, Ld. Addl. PP for State and have carefully perused the record.

8. In the present case, the applicant/ accused is facing trial for the offences punishable u/sec. 304(2)/317(2) BNS. Allegations against the applicant/ accused are serious in nature entailing grave punishment. Further, the investigation has revealed that both the mobile phones were recovered from the possession of accused. Further, that the TIP proceedings are still pending in the present matter.

9. Since, the investigation is at the nascent stage and the charge-sheet in the present matter is yet to be filed, no ground for grant of his bail is made out. **However, it is hereby directed to the IO that the TIP proceedings be fixed within 3 days of the complainant returning back to India.** Considering gravity of the matter, role of applicant/accused, other circumstances of this case, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant/ accused. **Accordingly, bail application of applicant/ accused Rajan Yadav @ Reejan Yadav, stands dismissed.**

Order Dasti.

[Sheetal Chaudhary Pradhan]
ASJ-02, South-East/Saket/Delhi
06.02.2026_(m)