



\$~27, 28 & 30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

(27)+ CRL.A. 373/2025

MANORANJAN D

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. KK Manan, Sr.Adv. with Ms.
Uditi Bali, Mr. Rahul Gautam, Mr.
Somarjun V.M, Advs.

versus

STATE THE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri (APP) , Mr.
Lalit Luthra Adv, Ms Vibha Adv.
SI Amit Bhati

(28)+ CRL.A. 1040/2025

SAGAR SHARMA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Somarjuna V M and Mr. Vivek
Kunar, Adv.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)

....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri (APP) , Mr.
Lalit Luthra Adv, Ms Vibha Adv.
SI Amit Bhati

(30)+ CRL.A. 1155/2025&CRL.M.A. 24236/2025

LALIT JHA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Kshitij Goel, Mr. Rishav Sharma,
Mr. Vikrant Yadav, Mr. Anushka Ojha
and Ms. Tanisha Adwani, Adv.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri (APP) , Mr.
Lalit Luthra Adv, Ms Vibha Adv
SI Amit Bhati



CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER
% **15.01.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. These three appeals have been filed by the Appellants challenging the following impugned orders:
 - **CRL.A. 373/2025**- Order dated 24th December, 2024 passed by ld. ASJ, Patiala House Court, New Delhi;
 - **CRL.A. 1040/2025**- Order dated 24th January, 2025 passed by ld. ASJ, Patiala House Court, New Delhi;
 - **CRL.A. 1155/2025**- Order dated 28th April, 2025 passed by ld. ASJ, Patiala House Court, New Delhi (*hereinafter, 'the impugned orders'*).
3. These appeals arise out of **FIR No. 142/2023**, registered at PS Parliament Street, u/s 186/353/153/452/201/34/120B IPC & Section 13/16/18 UAPA.
4. The allegations against the Appellants in the said FIR are that the Appellants had entered Lok Sabha in Parliament on 13th December, 2023, during the live session, and the Appellants– Mr. Manoranjan D and Mr. Sagar Sharma had started moving towards the well by jumping over the empty seats and had opened coloured smoke canisters in Lok Sabha. A yellow smog enveloped the Lok Sabha session, which led to immediate vacation of the entire space by the Parliamentarians and the same was broadcasted live on television as well.
5. The third Appellant– Lalit Jha was outside the Parliament and was raising slogans and throwing pamphlets. He was also the person to whom all



the other accused had handed over their mobile phones for safe custody and he was also involved in videographing the incident. Another allegation against him was that he had destroyed all the mobile phones and SIM cards, except one SIM card carrying no. +91 7988818218.

6. After registration of the FIR four of the accused persons, including Mr. Manoranjan D and Mr. Sagar Sharma were arrested on the same day *i.e.*, on 13th December, 2023, and the other Appellant– Mr. Lalit Jha surrendered at the police station on 15th December, 2023.

7. As of today, a charge sheet has been filed in **FIR No. 142/2023** and the proceedings before the trial court are continuing. Arguments on charge are stated to be going on before the Trial Court and charges are yet to be framed.

8. In the meantime, some of the other accused persons in **FIR No. 142/2023** , including one Neelam Ranolia and one Mahesh Kumawat had applied for bail, which was initially rejected by the Trial Court. In the appeals filed by said accused persons against the order of the Trial Court rejecting bail, the Division Bench of this Court in **CRL.A. 263/2025** and **CRL.A. 388/2025**, *vide* decision dated 2nd July, 2025, has granted bail to the said accused persons, subject to certain conditions.

9. During the pendency of the above-mentioned appeals filed by Neelam Ranolia and Mahesh Kumawat before this Court, the Appellants are stated to have applied for bail before the Trial Court which has now been rejected *vide* the impugned orders. Hence, the present appeals.

10. Mr. K.K. Manan, Id. Sr. Counsel for the Appellant in **CRL.A. 373/2025** submits that none of these Appellants have any previous involvement in any criminal activities. Their acts were in the nature of protest, arising out of their anguish and anger due to absence of sufficient employment opportunities. It



is further stated that the charges have not yet been framed by the Trial Court, despite two years having been passed by.

11. Mr. K.K. Manan, Id. Sr. Counsel further admits that though the method adopted by the Appellants for protesting is not correct, the fact that they are educated young people cannot be lost sight of.

12. Mr. K.K. Manan, Id. Sr. Counsel has also tried to draw distinction between offences u/s 13 and 18 in contrast with section 16 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, to argue that u/s 13, in respect of unlawful activity, the maximum sentencing period is seven years and under Section 18 the minimum sentencing period for conspiracy is five years. Under such circumstances, when the Appellants have already served more than two years in custody and the trial is not likely to conclude soon, they are entitled to bail during the pendency of the trial subject to imposition of certain conditions that this Court may deem appropriate.

13. Arguments are heard in part. Let the Id. Counsels for the parties examine the recent judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Gulfisha Fatima & Ors. v. State (2026 INSC 2)***, wherein the definition of “terrorist act” has been considered by the Supreme Court.

15. List for further hearing on 2nd February, 2026 on ‘Top of the Board’.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J

MADHU JAIN, J

JANUARY 15, 2026/PRG/ss