



2026:DHC:83



\$~24

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

%

Date of Decision: 07.01.2026+ **BAIL APPLN. 37/2026, CRL.M.A. 403/2026, 404/2026 & 405/2026**

LAIQ AHAMAD ALIAS SAENVE ALAM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bibek Tripathi and Mr. Subhakar
Tiwari, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF GNCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with SI Narender Singh, PS CR Park.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No.357/2024 of PS Chitranjan Park for offence under Section 309(6)/310(2)/311/317(3)/61(2)/3(5) BNS and Section 25/27 Arms Act.
2. I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Narender Singh.
3. Broadly speaking, the complainant *de facto* is in the business of jewellery and he alleged robbery at his house in which 3-4 persons carrying



a pistol snatched anklet of his wife and fled. It is stated in the FIR that on 28.11.2024 at about 08:30pm when the complainant *de facto* was present at his home, on hearing commotion from the side of kitchen he went there and opened the door to find that his servant, Harish had been caught hold by 3-4 persons, some of whom were carrying pistol and they rushed inside his home with the intention to commit robbery; that his wife who was standing behind him tried to stop them and they threatened him to hand over entire money and gold, otherwise they would kill him; that thereafter one of the robbers hit on his head while another robber snatched out an anklet from foot of his wife, after which they ran away.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the manner in which the offence has been alleged is completely unbelievable as it is not believable that 3-4 persons armed with a pistol and entering house of a jeweller would leave only after taking one anklet. Further, it is pointed out by learned counsel for accused/applicant that there is a delay of two days in lodging the FIR. It is also submitted by learned counsel that the co-accused Salim and Arman Ali have already been granted bail by the trial court.

5. On the other hand, learned prosecutor contends that the role of the present accused/applicant is different from role of Salim and Arman Ali. Learned APP has also shown me two CCTV footages of the alleged incident, as captured in mobile phone of the IO.

6. The CCTV footages shown to me present completely different picture. One CCTV footage depicts the complainant *de facto* sitting in room



2026:DHC:83



and 3-4 masked men enter and start assaulting him after which they drag him out. The other CCTV footage depicts that masked men were running out. As mentioned above, according to the FIR, it is only after the complainant *de facto* opened the door that the accused/applicant entered. Further, there is no footage depicting wife of the complainant *de facto* standing behind him or anklet being snatched. However, these aspects shall be dealt with after full dress trial by the trial court. Further, as mentioned above, there is a delay of two days in lodging the FIR also. There is no previous involvement of the accused/applicant according to the IO.

7. Considering the overall circumstances, 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. Accompanying applications also stand disposed of.

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

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

JANUARY 7, 2026/as