



2026:DHC:6317



\$~64

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

%

Date of Decision: 05.08.2026

#

CNR No. DLHC010354592026

+

BAIL APPLN. 3123/2026 & CRL.M.A. 23547/2026

MANOJ RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shannu Baghel, Advocate
(*through video conferencing*)

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
(*through video conferencing*) with SI
Vishwas, SI Bajrang and ASI
Virender Kumar.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 165/2024 of PS DBG Road for offence under Section 392/395/307/411/34 IPC.

2. It is appalling to note that three police officials, namely SI Vishwas, SI Bajrang and ASI Virender Kumar, have appeared claiming themselves to be the investigating officers but none of them is prepared with the matter. Even learned APP expresses anguish that none of these IOs briefed him about the matter. Despite repeated directions in numerous judicial orders, the investigating officers either do not brief the prosecutor or do not bring



investigation files or, worse, do not appear with preparation. Copies of those orders were also repeatedly sent to the concerned DCPs and the Commissioner of Police, but to no avail. This is not how issue of liberty of an individual should be dealt with by the State.

3. It appears from the aforesaid that the investigating agency has no serious objection to this bail application.

4. Broadly speaking, the prosecution case is that on 09.04.2024, the complainant *de facto* was shifting cash amount of Rs.25,00,000/- on his scooter on directions of son of his employer and at about 07:00pm, he was intercepted by four unknown individuals riding two motorcycles, after which one of them pointed a gun while the other one sprayed something due to which the complainant *de facto* was unable to see anything and the said assailants snatched the money bag and fled away. The role ascribed to the accused/applicant is that he was one of those four assailants. The TIP of the accused/applicant was successful.

5. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that all public witnesses have already been examined in trial and there is no purpose to keep the accused/applicant in jail. As regards the TIP, learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that the same was not carried out in accordance with law and in any case, it is not possible to believe that the complainant *de facto* would have been able to clearly see the assailants when according to



2026:DHC:6317



his own complaint, the assailants sprayed some material due to which he could not see clearly.

6. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find any reason to deprive further liberty to the accused/applicant.

7. Therefore, the bail application is allowed and accused/applicant is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

8. Accompanying application stands disposed of.

9. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Jail Superintendent for informing the accused/applicant.

10. Copy of this order be also sent to the Commissioner of Police through Senior Standing Counsel.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 05, 2026^{ry}