

BM no.536/26
State vs Jafar
FIR no.156/26
PS Seelampur

11.06.2026

Present: **Sh. Gaurav Singh**, ld. Addl. PP for the State
alongwith IO SI Shivam Sharma.
Chaudhary Abdul Rauf, ld. counsel for
accused/applicant.

This is the third application for bail u/s 483 BNSS moved on
behalf of accused/applicant.

Present FIR had been registered on the complaint of
complainant Anzum @ Chandni, who alleged that on 20.04.2026, she
and her husband Sahil were sleeping at their home and at about 9 a.m. on
hearing some noise, they came out of their house and saw that her jeth
Danish was soaked in blood because of knife blows. During this period,
accused/applicant alongwith his brother Faizan and two others came in
front of her house, who were telling to Danish that they would not spare
him as he had murdered their father. Thereafter, the accused/applicant
alongwith others gave a knife blow upon Danish, with an intention to kill
him, as a result of which, Danish received injuries. Accused/applicant
and his brother Faizan were having knife and pistol in their possession
which, during the incident, had fallen down. Complainant made a PCR
call and police reached at the spot and thereafter Danish was taken to JPC
hospital.

It is submitted in the application that accused/applicant is a
young boy of aged 30 years and is having clean antecedents. It is further
submitted that police of PS Seelampur falsely implicated the

accused/applicant in collusion with the injured Mohd. Danish. Present FIR is only a counter blast to the FIR no.155/26, PS Seelampur, which was registered on the complaint of Mohd. Amir, who is the nephew of the accused/applicant in relation to the murder of father of accused/applicant. It is further submitted that the weapons i.e. knife and pistol are totally planted by the police in connivance with the injured Danish. Injured Danish caused self inflicted injuries just to implicate the accused/applicant and to save himself from the proceedings in case FIR no.155/26. There are false allegations against accused/applicant and he has nothing to do with the incident as alleged. It is therefore, prayed that accused/applicant be released on bail.

Reply to the bail application has been filed by the IO. It is submitted in the reply that the present FIR no.156/26 is a counter case of FIR no.155/26. It is submitted that on 20.04.2026 on receipt of DD no.31A, IO reached the spot i.e. E-13/C-405, T huts, New Seelampur, where it came to his knowledge that injured Danish had already been removed to JPC hospital in critical condition. During inspection, one knife and pistol without magazine were recovered from the spot of incident and offence u/s 25 Arms Act has also been invoked. Complainant specifically named accused/applicant Jafar and his brother in her statement and alleged that both the accused attacked injured Danish with knife. Allegations against accused are grave and serious in nature. There is every possibility of tampering with evidence and influencing the witnesses. It is therefore, prayed that bail application of accused be dismissed.

I have heard ld. Addl. PP for State and ld. counsel for

applicant and perused the record very carefully.

It is submitted by Id. counsel for accused/applicant that accused has been falsely implicated in this case. After the murder of father of accused, in order to pressurize him and his family, a false case has been registered in connivance with police. He contended that even in the reply, the police admits that this case was a counter blast to FIR no.155/26, regarding the murder of the father of accused. Still the police did not even verify the genuineness of allegations. He has further contended that despite superficial injuries, which are infact self inflicted, offence of section 109 BNS has been registered. The weapons have been planted by the complainant and have not been recovered.

On the other hand, Id. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application and has contended that offence is serious in nature and in order to avenge the death of their father, accused/applicant and his brother had attacked the victim.

I have considered the rival submissions and perused the record.

Yesterday, the bail of co-accused had come up for hearing and it was observed by the court that IO himself in his reply had stated that this case was a counterblast to FIR no.155/26 and today also same facts have been stated. Yesterday, it was observed by the court that IO had not made any efforts to verify the genuineness of the allegations and that he was required to do so especially when he stated that this was a counterblast to FIR no.155/26. Similarly, a video was shown by the IO in his mobile phone yesterday and I had observed as under:-

“I had seen the said video on the mobile phone of the IO. The video had also been seen by Id. Addl. PP and the counsel and it had been pointed out that on the very beginning of the video, it appeared that one of the person who had caught hold of the accused therein was taking out something from his pocket, planting it upon the accused and thereafter one more person claimed to have snatched the pistol from the accused. I found this contention to be somewhat correct that there was an attempt to put something on the accused before alleged recovery of pistol was shown in this video. IO submitted that he had missed this point. I failed to understand how the IO could have missed that portion despite having that video with him”.

In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the fact that co-accused has already been granted bail and the period of custody, the application at hand is allowed. The applicant/accused is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.15,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned JMFC/Link JMFC/Duty JMFC and subject to the following conditions:-

- (a) Accused shall join the investigation as and when required and shall attend the court in accordance with the conditions of bond executed by him,
- (b) He shall not commit any offence similar to the offence, of which he is accused in the present case,
- (c) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the court or tamper with the evidence.
- (d) He shall not leave India without prior permission of the court

At request, the copy of order be given dasti to ld.
counsel for applicant.

(Parveen Singh)
Vacation Judge,
ASJ-03(NE)/KKD Courts/Delhi
11.06.2026