



2026:DHC:5486



\$~3

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

%

*Date of Decision: 09.07.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1745/2026**

BHANU@KUNAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shiv Kumar Gautam and Ms.  
Niharika Kashyap, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State  
with Inspector Murtuja Khan, PS  
Nabi Karim.

Mr. Sarthak Karol and Mrs. Neelakshi  
Bhadauria, Advocates for family of  
deceased.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

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

1. The accused/applicant seeks regular bail in case FIR No. 587/2023 of PS Nabi Karim for offence under Section 302/120B/34 IPC and Section 25/27/29 of Arms Act.

2. In furtherance of last order, status report was filed. Today I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by Investigating Officer/Inspector Murtuja Khan. I have also heard learned counsel for family of the deceased.



2026:DHC:5486



3. Broadly speaking, circumstances relevant for the present purposes are as follows. On the night intervening 26.10.2023 and 27.10.2023, at about 01:45am, while patrolling in the area, HC Dinesh of PS Nabi Karim saw a Child in Conflict with Law (CCL) running from Gali No.10, Multani Dhanda, Paharganj towards Choti Hatti, carrying a knife in his hand. On seeing HC Dinesh, the CCL fled and could not be located. When HC Dinesh reached Gali No.10, Multani Dhanda, he saw a male dead body lying on the track of a shrine. The dead body bore multiple stab wounds on face, neck, chest, stomach and lower part of the body. HC Dinesh called up the Duty Officer of PS Nabi Karim, who informed that one CCL had appeared in the police station and had presented a knife, confessing that he and his friend Akash had murdered Amit @ Bewda with that knife. Hands of the CCL were stained with blood, so he was detained in the police station. Under these circumstances, the FIR was registered and investigation was carried out. The role of the present accused/applicant that came to light during investigation is that he was informed about location of the deceased by co-accused Neeraj, and the accused/applicant accompanied the CCL and co-accused to the place where the alleged stabbing took place.

4. Learned counsel for accused/applicant claims parity on the ground that co-accused Neeraj was released on bail by this court vide order dated 28.01.2026. It is submitted by learned counsel that while granting bail to Neeraj, this court expressed doubts about truthfulness of the prosecution case, observing that if killing of the deceased was carried out by way of such



2026:DHC:5486



planned conspiracy, why would the CCL on his own go to the police with weapon of offence and blood stained hands.

5. Learned APP and learned counsel for family of the deceased strongly oppose the bail, submitting that the present accused/applicant is not entitled parity because role of the accused/applicant is distinct from Neeraj.

6. To begin with, as observed in the bail order dated 28.01.2026, there is no material to show that when Neeraj disclosed the location of the deceased to the present accused/applicant, Neeraj was aware that the present accused/applicant would convey the information to the CCL, who would in turn stab the deceased to death. Even as regards the allegation that Neeraj informed location of the deceased to the present accused/applicant, there is no material on record.

7. At the time of arguments on bail application of accused Neeraj, the Investigating Officer had not played in court the CCTV footage, which has been done today. The clear timeline of the CCTV footage would show a continuity of involvement of the present accused/applicant with the CCL and the co-accused Akash. It is made clear by the Investigating Officer that the timings depicted in the CCTV footage are faulty as the clock of the CCTV was faster by 02 hours 26 minutes. The CCTV footage depicts that at 03:36:30, the CCL enters the lane; at 03:36:44, the accused/applicant with co-accused Akash enters the lane and calls CCL, who returns and meets the



2026:DHC:5486



accused/applicant; at 03:44:52, the deceased enters the lane; at 03:52:00, the stabbing starts and at that time, the present accused/applicant is visible (*in the other camera*); at 03:53:18, co-accused Akash returns with knife in hand and limping because he also suffered injuries; and finally at 03:56:13, the CCL returns with knife in hand. Going by the above narrated timeline, the role of the accused/applicant is far more serious than that of co-accused Neeraj, so it is not a case of parity.

8. Keeping in mind the above narrated circumstances and seriousness of offence, I do not find it a fit case to grant bail. The bail application is dismissed.

9. It is made clear that none of the above observations shall be read against either side by the trial court and the final decision of the trial shall be on the basis of evidence adduced in the court.

10. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for being informed to the accused/applicant.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**JULY 09, 2026/ry**