

Bail Matters 555/2026
STATE Vs. VIPIN KUMAR
FIR No. 159/2026
PS- (Kalindi Kunj)
u/s 110/3(5) BNS

10.03.2026

Present application is being 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 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Vipin Kumar for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. S. K. Kain, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Mohd. Shadan and Sh. Imran Khan, Ld. Counsel
for the applicant/accused.
IO/SI Satyapreet, PS Kalindi Kunj.

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

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been languishing in JC since 17.02.2026 and this is the first regular bail application filed on his behalf. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present matter as he has nothing to do with the alleged offences and that the allegations have been exaggerated or manipulated due to personal animosity of complainant. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the alleged incident arose out of a prior dispute

between the complainant's friend Mayank @ Nanu and the applicant/accused. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the injuries of the complainant are simple injuries and are neither grievous nor dangerous to life and that the alleged injuries do not attract the rigorous of Section 117 BNS (voluntarily causing hurt). Ld. Counsel further submitted that the continued custody of the applicant/accused serves no purpose and would cause grave injustice and irreparable harm to him and his family. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused has no prior criminal antecedents and is a person of a good character. Ld. Counsel thus, submitted that applicant/accused ought to be granted bail and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him while granting the bail.

3. *Per contra* Ld Substitute Addl. PP for the State along with IO vehemently opposed the bail application citing the gravity of offences as one of the main grounds. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the role of the present applicant/accused is that he along with co-accused persons had beaten the injured/complainant and that he has been specifically named in the FIR. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the applicant/accused may harm the complainant and evade the process of law, if released on bail and thus, submitted that bail ought not to be granted to accused.

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

5. It is settled law that the Court, while considering the application for grant of bail, has to keep certain factors in mind,

such as, whether there is a *prima facie* case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment, the danger of the accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail; reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened; etc. However, at the same time, period of incarceration is also a relevant factor that is to be considered.

6. As per the IO's report, the complainant stated that on 15.02.2026, it was his friend's namely Mohit's birthday and at about 10:30 PM, he had gone to his house and when the complainant was coming from the house of Mohit and going to his home and reached near Kali Mandir, Phase-3, some boys came with iron rod and wooden danda and started beating him and he stated that he knew the names of Vipin (the present applicant/accused herein), Abhay, Zakir @ Mota and Saurabh and could identify some other. After that, he fainted and when he came in senses, he found himself in LBS Hospital. During the course of arguments, it was brought to the fore that the MLC result on the MLC of the injured Krishan was opined as 'simple' in nature by the doctor. Further, the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is not required for the further purpose of investigation of the case.

7. In the aforementioned circumstances, taking into account the submissions and the fact that the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is not required further and

that the nature of injury was found 'simple', I deem it fit to grant regular bail to accused Vipin Kumar, on his furnishing personal bond with surety bond of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of Ld. JMFC/Link JMFC/Duty JMFC/Court concerned, subject to the following conditions:

i) The applicant/accused shall not try to contact or influence the complainant/victim in any manner;

ii) He shall not tamper with evidence in any manner and shall regularly appear before the concerned court on each and every date of hearing; and

iii) He shall also furnish his mobile phone and mobile phone of his surety to the IO and shall keep his mobile phone operational round the clock and shall share his Google PIN to IO.

8. 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 regular bail application stands disposed of.

9. In compliance of **Sanjay Singh Vs. State (Govt of N.C.T of Delhi) Writ Petition Criminal 974/2022**, copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent to convey the order to inmate.

10. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)
ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),
South East District, Saket Court,
New Delhi /10.03.2026