



2026:DHC:2954



\$~1

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

%

*Date of Decision: 09.04.2026*

+

**BAIL APPLN. 235/2026 & CRL.M.A. 1941/2026**

CHANDER SHEKHAR ALIAS CHANDU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Pandey, Mr. Ashutosh  
Bhardwaj and Mr. Anmol Goyal,  
Advocates

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State  
with Inspector K.K. Mishra and  
Inspector Prakash, PS Malviya Nagar

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 600/2021 of PS Malviya Nagar for offence under Section 302/449/201/120B/34 IPC.
2. Broadly speaking, prosecution case is that on account of his extra marital affair, the accused namely Naveen Gullaiya hired three professional assassins, one of whom is the present accused/applicant. According to prosecution, the said three hired assassins entered house of the deceased



2026:DHC:2954



lady after opening the locks with keys, which had been provided to them by Naveen Gullaiya. The deceased lady was stabbed 22 times and she succumbed.

3. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is contended that the security guard of the area in his testimony as PW15 did not support the prosecution case and stated that police had taken his signatures on blank papers, on which his statement was fabricated. In view of testimony of PW15, learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that this is a fit case to grant bail.

4. On the other hand, learned APP for State, assisted by the IO Inspector K.K. Mishra, strongly opposes the bail application. Learned APP for State has played in the courtroom CCTV footage depicting all three assassins including the present accused/applicant entering the house of the deceased and after sometime, running out thereof. Further, it is submitted by learned APP for State that since statements of witnesses under Section 161 CrPC cannot be signed statements, testimony of PW15 alleging that on the blank papers got signed from him, his testimony was fabricated is not just falsehood but also reflects that PW15 has been won over by the accused persons and that being so, it would not be appropriate release the accused/applicant on bail. It is also submitted by learned APP for State that the keys and lock of the house of the deceased were got recovered from the present accused/applicant and those recovery witnesses are yet to be examined.



2026:DHC:2954



5. Having perused the CCTV footage, coupled with the above recorded submissions of both sides, I do not find it a fit stage to release the accused/applicant on bail. The bail application is dismissed.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that the accused/applicant is not depicted in the abovementioned CCTV footage. But till date, no such stand was taken by the accused/applicant before the trial court. Learned trial court also placed its decision largely on the CCTV footage, but not even a whisper was made that the person depicted in the CCTV footage is not the accused/applicant.

7. However, I must also record a word of caution that at the stage of final arguments, learned trial court shall take view independent from the above observations.

8. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for being conveyed to the accused/applicant immediately.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**APRIL 9, 2026/as**