



\$~39 to 41

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

+ CRL.A. 1484/2025

AMAR UGARSEN BHARADWAJ

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Gaurav Sharma (DHCLSC) with
Mr. Randeep Singh Gumber,
Advocate.
Ms. Siya Yadav, Advocate

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the State with
SI Jitender Singh, P.S. Moti Nagar.

40

+ CRL.A. 1491/2025

UMA SHANKAR YADAV

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Siddharth Satija, (DHCLSC) with
Mr. Akash Sachan, Ms. Anuka
Bachawat and Ms. Charu Sinha,
Advocates.
Ms. Siya Yadav, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the State with
SI Jitender Singh, P.S. Moti Nagar.

41



+ CRL.A. 1612/2025
GANESH KUMAR MAHTO

.....Appellant

Through:

versus

STATE THROUGH S.H.O OF P.S MOTI NAGAR DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the State with
SI Jitender Singh, P.S. Moti Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA

ORDER

%

24.04.2026

CRL.M.(BAIL) 2178/2025 in CRL.A. 1491/2025

CRL.M.(BAIL) 2170/2025 in CRL.A. 1484/2025

CRL.M.(BAIL) 2337/2025 in CRL.A. 1612/2025

1. These applications under Section 430 read with Section 582 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, have been filed on behalf of the accused persons in Sessions Case No. 56314 of 2016 on the file of the Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, seeking suspension of sentence during the pendency of the appeal. As per the impugned judgment dated 25.08.2025, the appellants/ accused persons have been found guilty of the offences punishable under Sections 452, 392 read



with Section 34 IPC. The accused no. 1 has also been convicted for commission of offences punishable under Sections 397 and 411 IPC. The accused nos. 2 and 3 have also been convicted for commission of offence punishable under Section 411 IPC. The accused persons have been sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. The sentences have been directed to run concurrently. Therefore, the maximum period of imprisonment that they will have to undergo is for a period of 7 years.

2. The learned counsel for the appellants submit that out of 7 years of the imprisonment, the accused persons have already served more than 4 years.

3. The applications are opposed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor who submits that in the light of the gravity of offences, this is not a fit case to suspend the sentence.

4. Heard both sides.

5. I have perused the materials on record and taking into account the gravity of the offence committed and the injuries



caused, this does not appear to be a fit case in which the sentence is liable to be suspended. However, as the appellants/accused persons have served more than half of the sentence, the hearing of the appeals can be expedited.

6. Hence, these applications seeking suspension of sentence are dismissed.

CRL.A. 1484/2025

CRL.A. 1491/2025

CRL.A. 1612/2025

7. Advocate Satyam Thareja, (DHCLSC) appearing on behalf of the appellant in CRL.A. 1612/2025 submits that the appellant has engaged another counsel. He, therefore, seeks discharge from the present matter.

8. Hence, the learned counsel appointed by the DHCLSC stands discharged from the CRL.A. 1612/2025.

9. List on 27.04.2026.

CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA, J

APRIL 24, 2026

mj