

Bail Matters 1353/2026  
State Of Delhi Vs. Tarun Alias Dorilal  
FIR No. 45/2026  
U/s 304(2)/3(5) BNS  
PS Maurice Nagar

11.07.2026

**This is an application u/s 482 of the BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail filed on behalf of the accused Tarun @ Dorilal.**

Present: Sh. Parvesh Ranga, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Sh. Sunil Tomar, Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant.  
SI Ramawati on behalf of IO SI Lydia.  
Reply filed. Taken on record. Copy be supplied.

Arguments heard.

It is submitted by ld. Counsel for the accused/ applicant that the accused/ applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that no bail application of either the accused/ applicant or of any co-accused person is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi or Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is submitted that there is nothing to connect the accused/ applicant with the offence in question. It is submitted that the accused/applicant is ready to join the investigation and there is no purpose of his custodial interrogation. It is submitted that the accused/applicant is not visible in the CCTV footage as has been framed by the prosecution. It has been prayed that the application be allowed.

Per contra, ld. Addl. PP for the State has opposed the bail application citing the seriousness of the allegations and gravity of the offence. It is submitted that the accused/applicant played a pivotal role in the commission of the offence. It is submitted that there are clinching evidence against the accused/applicant and the investigation shall suffer if the accused/applicant is given protection of anticipatory bail. It is prayed that the bail application be dismissed.

Considered.

As per the prosecution, the accused/applicant along with co-accused Vinit @ Vineet snatched the mobile phone of the complainant.

Though, the accused Vinit @ Vineet was arrested but the case property is yet to be recovered. Custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant is required by the IO for the purpose of recovery of case property and for the purpose of carrying out his TIP proceedings as per the IO Notice u/s 35(3) was affixed in front of his house but he did not do so.

Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case tiled as **CBI Vs. Anil Sharma (1997) 7 SCC 187 observed as under:**

“We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 if the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail during the time he interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

As such, in view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, in particular, the nature of allegations, role assigned and stage of the proceedings, in particular the requirement of the accused/applicant for custodial interrogation, I find no merits in the present application and the same is hereby disposed off as dismissed.

TCR be sent back to the Id. Trial court forthwith.

Dasti to all concerned.

(Bhupinder Singh)  
ASJ-05, Central District  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi  
11.07.2026