



\$~25 to 28

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ CRL.A. 450/2024  
RAJU LAL JAT .....Appellant  
Through: Mr. Tushar Malik, Adv. (through VC)

versus

STATE (NCT) OF DELHI .....Respondent  
Through: Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP.  
Mr. Harsh Prabhakar, DHCLSC with  
Mr. Dhruv Chaudhary, Mr. Shubham  
Sourav and Mr. Vijit Singh, Advs. for  
Victim.

26

+ CRL.A. 454/2024, CRL.M.(BAIL) 1972/2024, CRL.M.(BAIL)  
679/2025 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1222/2025  
MEHBOOB ALAM .....Appellant  
Through: Mr. S.N. Shukla, Mr. A.K. Jha and Mr.  
Shivesh Singh, Advs.

versus

STATE (NCT) OF DELHI .....Respondent  
Through: Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP.  
Mr. Harsh Prabhakar, DHCLSC with  
Mr. Dhruv Chaudhary, Mr. Shubham  
Sourav and Mr. Vijit Singh, Advs. for  
Victim.

27

+ CRL.A. 488/2024  
ANADIL HASAN .....Appellant  
Through: Mr. Tushar Malik, Adv. (through VC)

versus

STATE (NCT) OF DELHI .....Respondent  
Through: Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP.



Mr. Harsh Prabhakar, DHCLSC with  
Mr. Dhruv Chaudhary, Mr. Shubham  
Sourav and Mr. Vijit Singh, Advs. for  
Victim.

28

+ CRL.A. 774/2024  
RAM RATTAN AHLAWAT

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Harsh Prabhakar, DHCLSC with  
Mr. Dhruv Chaudhary, Mr. Shubham  
Sourav and Mr. Vijit Singh, Advs.  
with appellant in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yudhvir Singh Chauhan, APP.  
Mr. Ajay Verma, Ms. Smriti S. Nair,  
Advs. for R-2 & 4 along with R- 2 and  
4 (*through VC*)  
Mr. Tushar Malik, Adv. for R-3  
(*through VC*)

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK CHAUDHARY**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**ORDER**

% **02.12.2025**

**CRL.M.(BAIL) 679/2025 in CRL.A. 454/2024**(of appellant Mehboob Alam)

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the appellant seeking quashing/setting aside of the impugned Judgment dated 30/03/2004 and order on sentence dated 06/05/2024 passed by learned trial court in sessions case no. 27541/2016 in FIR no. 139/2011 under section 364A/302/394/201/120-B/34 IPC & Sec. 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station I.P. State whereby appellant has been held guilty and has been *inter alia*, sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life.



2. Vide this application; the appellant is seeking suspension of his sentence during the pendency of the appeal.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has already undergone substantial incarceration of approximately nine years and has clean antecedents.

4. It is further submitted that the prosecution case suffers from glaring contradictions and infirmities which, even otherwise, is based on circumstantial evidence and there are several missing links.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that family of the appellant consists of wife, two daughters aged about two years and one year. It is further submitted that his family is entirely dependent upon him as he is the sole bread winner of the family and there is no likelihood of the appellant absconding.

6. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for suspension of sentence/bail. It is submitted that the conviction rests on a complete and unbroken chain of circumstantial evidence. It is argued that crucial circumstance of 'last seen together' has been duly proved and moreover, recovery of the decomposed dead body of the deceased at the instance of two accused, including the present appellant, Mehoob Alam, as well as the recovery of the deceased's mobile phone at his instance clearly establishes his involvement in the crime. It is further submitted that the ransom calls were made from the deceased's mobile phone and upon the demand being refused, the deceased was murdered. Reference is also made to observations made by the learned Trial Court in paragraph no. 60 and 61 of impugned judgment, in particular.

7. Learned APP for the State submits that in view of the gravity of



offences punishable under Sections 364A/120B and 302/120B IPC carrying life imprisonment or death, the planned and brutal nature of the crime, and absence of any infirmity in the detailed trial court judgment, no case is made out for suspension of sentence or bail during pendency of the appeal.

8. We have given our anxious consideration to the rival contentions and have carefully gone through the Trial Court Record (TCR). We have also taken note of the testimony of the prosecution witness and the other material placed on record and keeping in mind the same, at this initial stage, we do not find any compelling reason to suspend the sentence of the appellant.

9. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.

**CRL.A. 450/2024**

**CRL.A. 454/2024**

**CRL.A. 488/2024**

10. List in due course.

**CRL.A. 774/2024**

11. All the respondents therein i.e., acquitted accused persons are directed to remain physically present before this Court on the next date of hearing.

12. In the meanwhile, the Registry is directed to provide electronic copy of the paper books, as well as, of the trial court record to all the parties.

13. List on 09.02.2026.

**VIVEK CHAUDHARY, J**

**MANOJ JAIN, J**

**DECEMBER 2, 2025/r/ht**